DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 609 CS 005 685

TITLE The Preparation of Teachers to Teach Reading and Associated Language Skills.
INSTITUTION Queensland Board of Teacher Education, Toowong (Australia).
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 124p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment: *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Reading Teachers; *Surveys; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

A study to evaluate the Queensland, Australia, programs of teacher education in reading and those associated language skills prerequisite to reading is described in this booklet. The first section reports the results of a survey of 267 beginning teachers, 47 college instructors in teacher education, 44 school administrators, and 205 supervising teachers to elicit their perceptions of the state of teacher preparation and concludes with a list of topics for further research. The second section presents the proceedings of a conference of the Queensland board of teacher education that recommended the following as a follow-up to the survey: (1) there should be a closer working relationship between schools and teacher training institutions in the preparation of teachers for the teaching of reading, and (2) training in the teaching of reading should be regarded as a continuous process throughout a teacher's career. The third section lists the course outlines offered in the teaching of reading and associated skills by ten Queensland teacher training institutions. Appendixes present survey information, including samples of the questionnaires. (AEA)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED193609

CS005685

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH READING AND ASSOCIATED LANGUAGE SKILLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. H. Fry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Report prepared for discussion and review purposes by the
Teacher Education Review Committee
of the Board of Teacher Education, Queensland

December 1979

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| FOREWORD | (iv) |
| SECTION I: TEACHING OF READING AND LANGUAGE SKILLS SURVEY | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 3 |
| TERMS OF REFERENCE | 3 |
| METHOD | 4 |
| SAMPLE | 6 |
| RESULTS: THE TEACHER EDUCATORS | 7 |
| PRIMARY TEACHER EDUCATION | 7 |
| 1. Aims and Objectives | 7 |
| 2. The time devoted to the teaching of reading and language skills | 8 |
| 3. The content of teaching of reading courses | 9 |
| 4. Organisation of training at college | 11 |
| 5. Organisation of training at practising school | 13 |
| 6. Liaison between college and practising school | 15 |
| PRE-SCHOOL AND SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION | 16 |
| DISCUSSION: THE TEACHER EDUCATORS | 17 |
| 1. Instruction and practice in the teaching of reading and language skills | 17 |
| 2. Organisation of training at college and practising school | 18 |
| 3. Liaison between college and practising school | 19 |
| RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: BEGINNING PRIMARY TEACHERS | 19 |
| 1. Preparation at college | 19 |
| 2. Preparation at practising school | 23 |
| 3. Preparation in 'first year out' | 27 |
| CONCLUSION | 30 |
| SECTION II: CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS | 33 |
| PREFACE | 35 |
| INTRODUCTION | 36 |
| SCHOOL PANEL | 37 |
| COLLEGE PANEL | 44 |
| GUEST SPEAKER | 55 |
| GROUP DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 62 |
| A FINAL STORY | 66 |
| SECTION III: OUTLINE OF COURSES | 67 |
| INTRODUCTION AND NOTES ON COURSE OUTLINES | 69 |
| COURSE OUTLINES: | 70 |
| Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College | 70 |
| Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education | 71 |
| Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education | 72 |
| James Cook University of North Queensland | 74 |
| Kelvin Grove College of Advanced Education | 75 |
| McAuley College | 79 |
| Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education | 80 |
| North Brisbane College of Advanced Education | 84 |
| Townsville College of Advanced Education | 88 |
| University of Queensland | 89 |
| APPENDICES | 91 |

## FOREWORD

One of the functions of the Board of Teacher Education is to keep teacher education in Queensland under continuous review and to make reports and recommendations on all aspects of teacher education.

As a direct consequence of this charter, the Board decided to embark on its first major research venture. It is appropriate that the important area of reading education was chosen as the initial subject for study.

The resulting report is divided into three sections. First, the results of a survey conducted by the Board are described. This is followed by the proceedings of a conference held by the Board as a follow-up to the survey. Finally, an outline is given of present or proposed courses in the teaching of reading and associated language skills, offered by Queensland teacher education institutions.

It is hoped that this document will help stimulate discussion amongst those members of the education fraternity and the public who are interested or involved in reading education and who share the same aim: to give children in Queensland schools the best education possible.

Professor B.H. Watts,
Chairman,
Board of Teacher Education.

## SECTION I

# SURVEY ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH READING AND ASSOCIATED LANGUAGE SKILLS

## INTRODUCTION

The survey arose out of the concern that had been expressed in the national media, and in public discussion, at the apparent lack of reading skills among students in Australian schools. As one of the functions of the Board of Teacher Education is teacher education review, it was decided to carry out a research project on the Teaching of Reading and Associated Language Skills in Queensland Schools.

The Board's Teacher Education Review Committee undertook the investigation and met first on 20 June 1977 to discuss the terms of reference and to determine the strategy to be adopted. The committee recommended and the Board subsequently resolved to hire a researcher who would carry out a survey under its direction and under the immediate supervision of the Executive Officer.

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference approved by the Board were as follows -

- To survey the opinions of students, teachers, parents, employers and other interested persons regarding the efficacy of the teaching of reading and associated language skills in Queensland schools, State and non-State, and at all age levels.
- To survey the opinions of student teachers, beginning teachers, lecturers, and school personnel regarding the adequacy and efficacy of training for the teaching of reading and associated language skills provided in universities and colleges of advanced education.
- To survey the opinions of teachers regarding the adequacy and efficacy of in-service training in the teaching of reading and associated language skills at all levels of schooling.
- To stimulate public discussion and debate on the teaching of reading and associated language skills.
- To report the results to the Board of Teacher Education.

The committee decided that it would concentrate its attention on this term of reference:

> To survey the opinions of student teachers, beginning teachers, lecturers, and school personnel regarding the adequacy and efficacy of training for the teaching of reading and associated language skills provided in universities and colleges of advanced education. (1)

In pursuing this goal, the committee hoped to ascertain the perceptions of these various groups for the purpose of stimulating discussion amongst:

- members of the Board of Teacher Education;
- staff on college programs for the preparation of teachers of reading;
- members of the general public and other bodies interested or involved in Reading Education.

Accordingly, the committee was to aim at the following outcomes -

- the production of three overall statements which would reflect the perceptions of all lecturers (Phase I), school personnel (Phase II) and beginning teachers (Phase III) respectively, who participated in the

(1) It was later decided not to interview student teachers. It was thought that beginning teachers would probably offer more pertinent comments on their training, especially in the light of their first year's teaching experience.

survey. These reports would be submitted to members of the Board of Teacher Education and also sent to all Queensland teacher training institutions;

- the production of three statements for each Queensland teacher training institution. These would reflect separately the perceptions of lecturers at that college, those of supervising teachers and administrators in the college's associated practising schools, and those of beginning teachers who had recently graduated from the college. The reports would be disseminated to the colleges as they became available, so as to encourage on-going discussion and debate between the Board and the colleges and amongst staff members themselves;

- the organisation of a one-day conference at the conclusion of the survey to stimulate discussion amongst a wider audience who were interested or involved in Reading Education (1). A short summary of the survey would be forwarded to participants prior to the conference. After the conference, a publication would be produced containing the results of the survey in detail; the proceedings of the conference; and an outline of present or proposed courses in the teaching of reading and language offered by Queensland teacher training institutions (this publication).

## METHOD

### Phase I: Interviews with Lecturers

At the July 1977 meeting, the Teacher Education Review Committee asked the newly appointed research assistant to write a background paper on the most recent research into reading standards. (The paper was presented at the August 1977 meeting). After this initial orientation, the committee decided to conduct a pilot study among 'first year out' teachers to gain an indication of the directions the survey should take.

Accordingly, the research assistant held two informal interviews during September 1977 at the Board's address with two groups of 10 'first year out' primary teachers. A discussion starter was prepared prior to the commencement of the interviews. (See Appendix A). As these meetings were meant to aid in the development of a statewide survey, an attempt was made to select as representative a group as possible. The result was that there were included in the interviews, recent graduates from eight out of the nine primary teacher training bodies who were then teaching in State schools situated in high, medium and low socio-economic districts and also in Catholic and Independent schools.

From the issues arising out of this pilot study, and from discussions that were held with interested people in the field of reading education, an open-ended questionnaire was developed that could be used in interviews with lecturers. (See Appendix B).

Prior to the commencement of the interviews, the committee invited the college directors or their representatives to the October 1977 meeting of the Teacher Education Review Committee. The committee sought the co-operation of those present in carrying out the survey and the Chairman also agreed to contact those directors who were not able to attend.

During November-December 1977, the research assistant visited 11 Queensland teacher training bodies at a mutually convenient time and conducted group interviews with lecturers involved in the teaching of reading and the language arts (2). Since the aim of the interviews was to seek the personal opinions of staff members as well as a more precise statement on the actual content of reading courses, an informal approach was adopted rather than a more statistical-quantitatively based research. All interviews were taped and later transcribed, analysed and summarised so as to identify the major issues arising from them.

(1) The conference was held on 26 May 1979.

(2) Separate individual interviews were conducted at BKTC and CIAE. Only one lecturer was interviewed at XTC.

During February 1978, the 11 summaries were sent to the respective colleges and universities, and directors and staff members involved were asked to comment and update any information contained in them. In the following few months, comments were received from eight of the teacher training institutions and these have been incorporated into this final report. The results of Phase I outlined in this report represent a compilation of the issues arising from the college interview transcripts, together with these additional comments.

## Phase II: Interviews with Supervising Teachers and Administrators

At the February 1978 meeting of the Teacher Education Review Committee, it was decided to carry out Phase II of the survey in a similar manner to Phase I. Accordingly, an open-ended questionnaire was constructed which paralleled the content of the Phase I questionnaire as much as possible. (See Appendix C).

The questionnaire aimed to cover the following topics: the nature of 1977 or 1978 second and third year pre-service students' practice and instruction in the teaching of reading at practising school; an evaluation of 1977 or 1978 second and third year pre-service students' ability to teach reading (1); the quality of liaison between college and practising school; and opinions concerning organisation of training at college and practising school.

In each of the practising schools one group interview of approximately 1½ hours' duration was conducted with supervising teachers (2). A separate interview varying from 20-45 minutes length was conducted also with administrators in each practising school. Interviews were taped and later transcribed, analysed and summarised so as to identify the major issues.

Eight reports were written, one for each teacher training institution. These reports reflected separately, the issues arising from the sample of each college's practising schools. The reports were forwarded to the respective colleges as they were completed. In accordance with the survey's purpose (viz., to stimulate discussion concerning teaching of reading courses) comments were invited from directors and staff members involved in college programs for the teaching of reading.

The results of Phase II outlined in this report represents a compilation of the eight Phase II individual college reports and mainly concentrates on the issues more general to the total sample.

## Phase III: Beginning Teachers

In the third and final phase of the survey, a different approach was used in that a structured questionnaire was mailed to a sample of beginning primary teachers. A smaller number of beginning teachers was also interviewed in college groups in a similar fashion to Phases I and II.

The mailed structured questionnaire (Appendix D) and the open-ended questionnaire used in the interviews (Appendix E) aimed to ascertain beginning teachers' opinions on the preparation and help that they had received at college; at practising school; and in their first months of teaching.

Both questionnaires were divided into two sections. First, questions were asked concerning beginning teachers' overall impressions of their teacher training. This was followed by questions specifically related to their preparation in the teaching of

(1) Due to the practice teaching arrangements at McAuley College, opinions were also asked of their first year students. Also, most teachers in the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education sample supervised second year students only (and not third years).

(2) In three of the 28 schools only, the first half (Section A) of the questionnaire was covered in three separate interviews, one each with supervising teachers from the three different school levels. The remainder of the interview (lasting approx. 45 minutes) was conducted in a whole group situation. This arrangement was made because of the schools' inability to release all supervising teachers (a maximum of nine teachers) for the full 1½ hours.

reading. It was therefore possible to place beginning teachers' opinions on 'reading' in the context of their overall teacher preparation.

The structured questionnaire was analysed with the aid of the University of Queensland's PDP-10 computer, using the SPSS statistical package. The group interviews were taped and later transcribed, analysed and summarised so as to identify the major issues.

Seven individual confidential college reports were written, one for each primary teacher training institution included in Phase III. These reports reflected separately the responses of graduates from each college. The results of Phase III outlined in this report, however, concentrate on those findings pertaining to the total sample.

## SAMPLE

### Phase I: Interviews with lecturers

An attempt was made to engage all available lecturers in the teaching of reading and the language arts in Queensland teacher training institutions. This resulted in a total of 47 lecturers participating in individual college group interviews during November-December 1977. (Details in Appendix F).

### Phase II: Interviews with Supervising Teachers and Administrators

A sample of 28 practising schools was drawn with the help of the Research Branch of the Queensland Department of Education. The sample included three associated pre-school practising schools of Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College and 25 associated primary practising schools of the seven Queensland tertiary institutions training primary teachers (1).

In each of the three pre-school practising schools, the teacher-in-charge was interviewed. In each of the 25 primary practising schools, an attempt was made to randomly select three supervising teachers from each of the three levels of the school (lower, middle and upper schools). This was not always possible due to the non-availability of supervising teachers, but each practising school had representatives from the three levels. School administrators involved in the training of student teachers were also invited to participate in separate interviews at each practising school.

In Phase II of the survey, a total of 205 supervising teachers and 44 administrators participated in the interviews. (Details in Appendix G).

### Phase III: Beginning Teachers

In the first stage of Phase III, a structured questionnaire was mailed (with an accompanying reply-paid envelope and cover letter) at the end of March 1979 to a random sample of 246 beginning primary teachers throughout Queensland, employed by the Queensland Department of Education and Catholic Education Offices. The sample was limited to those beginning teachers who had graduated at the end of 1978 with a three-year pre-service Diploma of Primary Teaching (approximately one-quarter of all Queensland Dip.T.(Primary) graduates). The initial response to the questionnaire was 67 percent (N = 177). In the middle of April, a follow-up letter and another copy of the questionnaire (with reply-paid envelope) was sent to those teachers who had not yet replied. The final response was 87 percent (N = 215). (Details in Appendix H).

In the second stage of Phase III, 39 beginning teachers resident in Brisbane were randomly selected from the sample to be interviewed in college groups. This number was supplemented by a further 13 beginning teachers outside this original sample, so

(1) NBCAE, MGCAE, KGCAE, TCAE, CIAE, DDIAE, McAC. The committee decided not to include in the report any associated practising schools from Xavier Teachers College due to its closure at the end of the 1978 academic year. The two universities (JCU, UQ), were also not included in Phase II of the survey as they train secondary teachers only.

that a sufficient number of provincial college graduates could be interviewed also. (Total N = 52). A maximum of 10 teachers took part in each college group interview. (Details in Appendix i).

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Before proceeding to the results section, a few points should be made concerning their possible interpretation.

First, the results outlined are intended to convey the perceptions of those who took part in the survey and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Board of Teacher Education.

Second, the report concentrates on those findings that pertain to the total Phase I, II and III samples, but this does not mean that every issue described necessarily applies to every teacher training institution or school that participated in the survey. (As was noted above, individual college reports of the three phases have already been sent to the respective teacher training institutions).

Third, it is to be hoped that readers will regard the information contained in this report in the manner that it was intended: to stimulate discussion concerning the teaching of reading and associated language skills. The Board recognises that there are no simplistic solutions to the problems raised in the survey, for these issues are complex matters and have bedevilled those persons associated with the betterment of teacher education for many years.

Be that as it may, it is hoped that the results of the three phases outlined below convey to the reader the perceptions (whether thought to be correct or incorrect) of lecturers, principals, supervising teachers and beginning teachers concerning the preparation of teachers for the teaching of reading and associated language skills.

## RESULTS: THE TEACHER EDUCATORS

The following paragraphs outline the updated results of Phase I: Interviews with Lecturers (November-December 1977); and Phase II: Interviews with Supervising Teachers and Administrators (April-November 1978).

### PRIMARY TEACHER EDUCATION (1)

1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1.1 Lecturers - Phase I:

Lecturers in each college were asked what they thought were their main objectives and to what extent they could meet them.

All colleges thought that, in a pre-service program, the main objective of their reading courses was to enable a student to begin to cope in the classroom with the wide range of problems that existed there. There was a consensus of opinion that this could only be achieved to a certain degree, as a student needed experience really to come to grips with what actually were the problems.

For this reason, all colleges strongly advocated in-service courses for all teachers. Five out of the nine colleges thought that such courses should mainly involve problems of a practical nature, together with their philosophical and theoretical underpinnings. Such courses might include organisation of reading programs, curricula and materials and the development of a 'total picture' of the reading process which would lead to the use of an eclectic approach to the teaching of reading.

(1) The opinions of lecturers from BKTC are included in this section as they train students for Pre-school to primary Year 3.

The remaining four colleges thought that such courses should mainly involve the teaching of remedial skills. These skills and the theories underlying them would be more meaningful in the light of a teacher's classroom experience.

It would appear then that the major problem arising from this section is the inability of colleges to meet the object of giving pre-service students the skills to cope with a wide range of problems in the classroom. By virtue of students' inexperience, they are unable to cope with the concepts involved in remedial work, and also have difficulty in developing 'all embracing' classroom reading programs.

It should be noted that these problems are recognised by the colleges. Most lecturers stated that they emphasised the need for students to know when to 'call for help' in their first year out.

### 1.2 Practising School Personnel - Phase II:

Supervising teachers were asked 'What teacher skills do you aim to develop in students through practice in the teaching of reading?'

In their answers to this question, supervising teachers spoke of aims of developing student teachers' skills in the following areas: preparing and presenting reading lessons; detecting reading deficiencies and recognising children's differing ability levels; and organising a classroom reading program.

The majority of teachers spoke of developing students' skills in preparing and presenting lessons. These aspects included a knowledge of word attack; comprehension and study skills; the ability to ask questions effectively; the ability to vary lessons and to be flexible; and the ability to communicate and express oneself confidently.

The second most frequent answer centred upon the detecting of reading deficiencies and recognising children's differing ability levels. These aspects included the ability to realise when certain children need extra attention; the ability to administer and interpret standard reading tests; the ability to get down to a child's level; and the ability to be patient with slow learning children.

Answers also covered a third area of objectives - the ability to organise a classroom reading program. Supervising teachers spoke of developing students' ability in seeing the overall plan of a reading scheme or program and not just the isolated reading lesson; and the ability to organise and run a class reading program effectively in groups.

In putting these aims into practice, supervising teachers reported problems which they faced when giving teaching of reading practice to student teachers. These problems mainly centred upon the students' apparent lack of knowledge of how to teach reading. These problems will be elaborated in later sections, but first, however, a brief description will be made of the nature of a student's training at college and practising school, viz., the amount of time devoted to the teaching of reading and language courses; and the content of those courses.

## 2. TIME DEVOTED TO THE TEACHING OF READING AND LANGUAGE

### 2.1 Amount of time at College - Phase I:

Most colleges reported an increase in the number of hours devoted to the teaching of reading in recent years. An estimate of the average number of compulsory hours devoted to it was 85 hours. There was a considerable range (16-176 hours), although the median was approximately 80 hours. Perhaps these figures should be treated with caution, however, as there were differences of opinion as to what constituted teaching of reading hours.

It is important to note in this section that most lecturers from all colleges stated that they wanted a further extension to the number of compulsory hours devoted to the teaching of reading. Recent correspondence between the Board and colleges indicates that

**the number of hours devoted to courses in the teaching of reading has actually been increased in many colleges. This is particularly reflected in submissions of teacher education programs to the Board's Course Assessment Committee. (For further details, see Section 3 of this publication.)**

2.2 Amount of time at Practising School - Phase II:

Supervising teachers were first of all asked the number of reading lessons they set each week of teaching practice, which required prior written preparation of 'full notes' or 'lesson steps' (1). The major factor governing the number of written prepared lessons set was the level of the school at which the student was placed. In general, the number of lessons differed according to whether the student carried out his or her practice in the lower, middle or upper schools. While there was variation within school levels in the number of written prepared lessons set, in general, the number decreased as the school level increased. For example, the median of the number of written prepared lessons set in the lower, middle and upper schools was three, two and one respectively. Similarly, the mode was five, two and nil respectively (2).

In the practising schools of two colleges, a second factor affected the number of written prepared reading lessons set a student teacher. Supervising teachers reported that students select one area of the primary curriculum and develop it in detail while at practising school. If a student chose Mathematics, Social Studies or Drama, reading lessons would not predominate during that period. On the other hand, a student who developed a Language Arts unit in detail would more likely, though not necessarily, teach a greater proportion of reading lessons.

3. THE CONTENT OF TEACHING OF READING COURSES

3.1 Content at College - Phase I:

All colleges reported that they were doing their best to teach students to be able to cope with reading at all levels of the primary school (3). The major emphasis in content was on the developmental aspect of reading, i.e. reading was to be taught right through the school system at every age.

Towards this end, the content of the courses included such things as familiarity with a wide range of commercially available reading schemes; decoding skills; comprehension skills; classroom and time organisation skills; study and library skills; and book readability. Six of the colleges specifically mentioned also the inseparability of language aspects from reading in the content of their courses.

Lecturers reported that the methods used to teach reading courses depended upon the number of students participating. Generally, a lecture format followed up by tutorials or workshop groups was used in their compulsory courses. In two colleges however, lecturers stated that they were able to use mainly tutorials, seminars and workshops.

The colleges were divided on the question whether their teaching techniques should set the example for those techniques recommended to teachers in their classroom. Opinions varied from 'We think it's desirable that we practise what we preach' to 'Tertiary teaching is quite different from primary teaching. Adults should not have to be taught like primary children'. Some lecturers took the middle line and held an opinion similar to: 'The lecture is the best way to impart knowledge and the small group workshop or seminar, to teach techniques'.

(1) DDIAE supervising teachers were asked 'each term of teaching practice' (10 days altogether) since their second year students mainly visited practising schools one day per week for 10 weeks during a term.

(2) For calculation purposes, the answers of DDIAE supervising teachers were divided by two to give an approximation of the lessons set each week (i.e. 10 - 2 = 5 days).

(3) XTC's charter only called for the training of teachers for Years 4-7 and BKTC, pre-school to Year 3.

Lecturers also reported that different components of the teaching of reading were emphasised according to the availability of time and material resources at each college.

There was considerable variation in the adequacy of material resources (literature journals, curriculum materials, etc.) in the colleges for teaching of reading courses. Statements varied from 'very inadequate' to 'fairly well equipped'.

Two of the colleges reported that their material resources were inadequate. The other seven stated that resources were adequate although six of them spoke also of certain insufficiencies. One college in this group wanted an improvement in the area of tests and inventories; three colleges needed more curriculum materials, especially reading schemes; and the remaining two colleges needed a resources room to allow students access to materials.

Lecturers were also asked whether the Language Arts Curriculum Guide was easily available to student teachers. All colleges regarded the Guide as an important resource for students in the teaching of reading and it was usually on the prescribed reading list. It was extensively analysed and evaluated.

Seven out of the nine colleges thought that the Guide was a fairly good document, if only teachers would take the time to read it. All added, however, that this task was not made very easy because the document was poorly organised, cumbersome, badly bound, badly indexed, etc.

Criticisms of the content included: an unfortunate division between Years 1-3 and 4-7; the separation of literature from reading; the ignoring of reading, especially study skills; and the Guide reinforcing the notion of teacher as technician rather than as professional.

Finally, questions were asked concerning lecturers' qualifications to teach the content of teaching of reading and language courses.

Of the 38 lecturers interviewed at the nine primary teacher training institutions, the vast majority (35) stated that they had experienced teaching in primary schools. Twenty-three of them answered that they had taught primary school at all levels. Eight of the 38 lecturers reported that they had also practical experience in a remedial/resource or special educational field.

When lecturers were asked their qualifications in the reading/language field, answers varied considerably. With the exception of eight lecturers, all reported that they had undertaken various tertiary courses on the subject. Ten of them were continuing their studies (or had completed them) in the language/reading area at the Masters level and a further three lecturers, at the Ph.D. level. Many expressed a desire to do further specialist courses in reading in Australia. However, it was thought by some that there were not adequate facilities here and the difficulties of getting study leave excluded them from overseas study.

3.2 Content at Practising School - Phase II:

Supervising teachers were first of all asked the types of reading lessons set a student teacher, which required prior written preparation of 'full notes' or 'lesson steps'. The answer to this question was such that, while there was a degree of variation within school levels (especially in the middle schools), in general, the emphasis in the lower school was on word attack skills (phonics, sight vocabulary, word games, etc.) and in the upper school, lessons based on the teaching of comprehension (recall of facts, inferences) and study skills (picking out main ideas, note taking, etc.).

A second question was asked concerning the types of lessons set: 'Do you ever set reading lessons that do <u>not</u> require prior written preparation?'. Most supervising teachers answered yes to this question. The main types of activities set included supervising a group for oral reading; administering an S.R.A. kit or Pilot Library; reading to children; and helping or supervising children's written work in reading.

In order to gain more detail on the nature of the lessons set (whether written prepared or not) supervising teachers were asked whether or not they ever assigned a student teacher to a child or a small group of children to practise teaching of reading skills. In their answers, most teachers stated that they set group exercises but did not require any prior written preparation. (The types of activities were similar to those described above). Only a minority of supervising teachers also set group reading lessons that required written preparation. Approximately a quarter of the upper school supervisors, a third of the middle school supervisors and half of the lower school supervisors, set such written prepared group reading lessons. This type of lesson involved the teaching of specific skills rather than just the supervising of various activities.

Next on the types of reading lessons set, a question was asked concerning the context of a reading lesson. Supervising teachers were asked whether or not they set student teachers reading lessons in other subject areas such as Science, Mathematics or Social Studies. In general, supervising teachers answered that a directed reading lesson would probably not be set in these subject areas although problems in content would probably be discussed incidentally. However, a comprehension lesson could include material from Science or Social Studies areas. Study and research type skills (fact finding, note taking, etc.) were also utilised in Science or Social Studies projects and students could be asked to give help to children in this area during their Science or Social Studies lessons.

Supervising teachers were also asked how they mainly assisted student teachers in the teaching of reading while they were at practising school. Teachers answered that they mainly assisted student teachers by first of all giving an observation lesson to familiarise the student with the practicalities involved in the implementation of a reading lesson. Students were also made familiar with the organisation of the reading program and the scheme or material with which the class was operating. The lesson to be taught was then specified and the main steps discussed. In assisting the student, supervising teachers mainly set lessons by utilising their own C.C.P. or the teacher's handbook of a reading scheme. In general the Language Arts Curriculum Guide was not used directly in the setting of reading lessons. (Teachers reported that the L.A.C.G. contained some good ideas but the Guide was very badly organised and difficult to 'wade through'). Finally, supervising teachers assisted by assessing the students' lessons either by writing comments on their lesson preparation book or discussing with them various aspects of the lesson.

Finally, supervising teachers were asked whether student teachers had used diagnostic reading tests or evaluated a pupil's reading ability. Most supervising teachers reported that as far as setting the exercise themselves was concerned, this was usually left to chance and only happened when they had to test or retest children in their class. On the apparent occasional times when most colleges had set such an exercise, the comments from the supervising teachers were such that it did not appear to be an integral or regular part of a student teacher's practice. Generally, supervising teachers did not know much about the exercise. In most cases they did not oversee it to any great degree. The general impression was that the use of diagnostic tests or evaluation techniques did not appear to be an essential part of a student teacher's practice teaching.

## 4. ORGANISATION OF TRAINING AT COLLEGE

### 4.1 Lecturers' Opinions:

Lecturers were first of all asked whether the teaching of reading was a multi-disciplinary activity within the college or not. The transcripts revealed that in six of the nine primary teacher training institutions, the responsibility for the teaching of reading was mainly in the hands of a few lecturers within one department. Co-ordination of the content of the courses was made easy either because of the few lecturers involved or because of the small size of the institution.

In the three remaining larger colleges, the responsibility for the teaching of reading was a multidisciplinary one. In two of these institutions, co-ordination was achieved

through meetings of a reading committee. In the other institution, a co-ordinator was appointed right across the college in 1978.

The biggest organisational problem that emerged from the transcripts was where the teaching of reading should be placed within the college curriculum. This problem may be outlined as follows:

If the teaching of reading is treated as an isolated unit, then it may lose its relevance especially in its relation to the content areas. On the other hand, there is a distinct possibility that the teaching of reading might 'get lost', when it forms only part of a curriculum studies course. Although the integration of reading and its related language aspects within a broader context may be desirable, it is debatable whether this would be sufficiently highlighted in the often confused minds of inexperienced students.

As to the actual college policies on this matter, the transcripts show that four of them integrated the units of reading within other courses, while the remaining five mainly treated reading and/or its related language aspects, as a unit within itself.

In conclusion, there was a difference of opinion between the colleges as to the way the teaching of reading should be organised. The balance probably would have tipped in favour of treating the teaching of reading and its related language aspects as a separate unit.

Be that as it may, the impression received from the transcripts was that this question had not yet been resolved.

Apart from these organisational factors, however, perhaps it is important to mention at this point that there were lecturers from several colleges who considered that the success of teaching of reading and language courses was also very much dependent on the individual student. These factors included a student's expectations of himself; a sensitivity and an understanding of the way children operate in language; an awareness of his own personal response to literature; and a commitment to the teaching of reading. One college believed that in many cases students had not taken many of the opportunities offered to them, while a lecturer from another college thought it debatable whether students had the maturity to cope with self-directed activities.

Generally, the colleges thought that the non-commitment of some student teachers would probably sort itself out as competition became fiercer for college places. However, there still remained the problem of relevancy of training for students who had not yet had the chance to experience the problems of handling a class.

4.2 Opinions of Practising School Personnel:

Supervising teachers and administrators were asked: 'From your observation of student teachers, what contribution do you think the college at present makes in the training of student teachers to teach reading?'. The responses from both supervising teachers and administrators were not generally of a positive nature. Opinions varied from 'very little or nil' to 'The college probably gives them a lot of theoretical knowledge but they haven't got the practical knowledge to back it up'.

Generally, both supervising teachers and administrators felt that students were not gaining the practical knowledge of how to actually teach reading in the classroom situation.

As far as a student's knowledge of reading schemes is concerned, supervising teachers felt that student teachers knew a little about the more popular schemes or kits such as Endeavour or S.R.A. but generally, only a scant knowledge of reading schemes was displayed. Most supervising teachers stated that they had to make the student familiar with the scheme with which the class was operating, before they commenced their teaching practice.

It was also felt that student teachers displayed an apparent lack of knowledge of the

components of reading and of the methods by which to teach them. Teachers reported that, usually, they had to set out the steps of the lesson for the student. Very rarely did a student take the initiative in the preparation and presentation of a reading lesson.

While the opinions outlined above were held generally, some supervising teachers drew attention to several possible explanations. First, there was a problem for students in that they might get to know the methods used in a particular classroom but because every teacher approached things differently, student teachers would have to change to suit the new supervising teacher each practice. Second, it was possible that student teachers might be indirectly encouraged to mimic the style and the methods of their supervising teachers, especially when most lessons were preceded by observation lessons. As a student was also graded by the supervisor, he or she would be more likely to mimic what had been observed in the classroom, and in doing so, please the supervising teacher. Finally, some supervising teachers believed that no matter what was taught at college, students would always have difficulty in putting theory into practice by virtue of their inexperience.

Be that as it may, it must be noted that most supervising teachers were of the opinion that student teachers were not as aware of the different methods of teaching reading as perhaps they could be. Most respondents blamed the respective college for this situation as they felt that the courses conducted there were isolated both physically and/or in content from the practical classroom environment.

When asked how they would like to see teaching of reading courses organised, supervising teachers and administrators generally responded with answers to the effect that curriculum content and methodology were most important. It was felt that all student teachers should have a thorough knowledge of the reading curriculum and the methodology required to implement it. Most answers centred upon a knowledge of the necessary components and materials of the teaching of reading (phonics, comprehension, reading schemes, etc.) and the steps needed to teach them. It was felt that if colleges concentrated on these practical aspects, students would have something on which to cling when first faced with a classroom of children.

## 5. ORGANISATION OF TRAINING AT PRACTISING SCHOOL

### 5.1 Lecturers' Opinions:

In answer to the question 'What would you like to see added to present courses?', six out of the nine colleges answered that they wanted an increase in the practical experience for students of the teaching of reading. There is, apparently, a perennial problem in matching theory with practice.

The impression gained from the transcripts is that the co-ordination between reading lecturers at college and normal teaching practice is minimal. Several colleges, however, spoke of attempts to improve the match. For example, in one college, students studied general lesson and curriculum plan development before going to practising school. Similarly, in another college, lecturers taught the curriculum of the specific school level in which the student would consequently practise.

Nevertheless, the transcripts reveal that only one out of the nine colleges believed that it was able to actually specify the types of reading lessons taught by the student. There appeared to be a problem of control in which the practising school had over-riding responsibility for the students training at practising school but it was the college who had to pay the practising teacher for training the student. In this situation, the 'employer' did not apparently have real control over its 'employees'.

In attempts to improve the organisation of practical training, however, and thereby the theory-practice match, several colleges reported alternative approaches that were additional to the normal practising school period:

(i) Lecturers in one college wanted to move towards a school-based method in which college lecturers would take their courses in the schools.

Students and staff would be involved in the actual planning and partial implementation of a school reading scheme.

(ii) In a second college, 1978 second year students had a timetable provision built into their reading courses to allow for guided school observational visits in addition to the normal practice teaching period. Third year students then visited a school over a 10 week period to practise diagnostic and teaching strategies with pupils who were having reading/learning problems.

(iii) In another college, students in a Developmental Reading course spent weekly tutorials in a 'model' school where they had the opportunity to practise what they had been hearing in theory.

(iv) Finally, at a fourth college, students in an elective course had the opportunity to work with children at the college remediation centre. Greater practice would also be facilitated at a fifth college when their Child Study Centre came into operation.

Lecturers were also asked 'Do you find that students have enough practice and variety in the teaching of reading at their schools?'.

Only one out of the nine colleges believed that this was possible. A second college believed that it was difficult to answer the question as colleges did not have much control over the practice school environment. Most lecturers from the seven remaining colleges, however, answered that within the present organisational framework, they did not believe that students received enough practice and variety in the teaching of reading.

Several reasons were expressed for this answer. First, there was a limitation on the number of different practising schools a student visited. Second, there was concern that the range of abilities of the supervising teachers might be wider than the lecturers would like them to be. For example, when asked whether supervising teachers presented satisfactory models for the teaching of reading, five of the colleges answered in the negative. Of the four remaining colleges, however, three expressed the view that it was difficult to make a judgment in this area as unfortunately, lecturers were not always aware of what was actually happening in the classroom.

5.2 Opinions of Practising School Personnel:

Supervising teachers and administrators also saw problems with the organisation of training at practising school. In many ways, it was not as valuable as it could be.

No consensus was arrived at concerning how supervising teachers would like to see the practising school experience organised. Most answers, however, suggested the need for more teaching practice in schools. Respondents' answers appeared to attempt to strike a balance between the need to satisfy two requirements: the need to give student teachers practice at intervals throughout the school year, in order to follow the reading development of children (especially in the lower grades); and the need to give students daily practice in the teaching of reading, in order to give an idea of the continuous nature of a reading program.

Accordingly, most suggestions centred upon when student teachers should carry out their teaching practice. No pattern emerged but the suggestions included the following: a teaching practice of one week at regular intervals throughout the year; two weeks per term; one day per week which would culminate in a block practice; and observational experiences additional to the normal practice period.

If it was felt that the practising school experience was not at present as valuable as it could be for student teachers, what attempts were made to close the gaps in knowledge that would exist for beginning teachers? Administrators were asked 'How do you induct beginning teachers into the teaching of reading?'.

Generally, the answers by administrators was that induction was carried out informally rather than specific courses being organised. New teachers were usually introduced to the reading scheme being used in the school and experienced teachers were placed alongside to guide them. Demonstration lessons could also be given by the administration.

Administrators were also asked whether they had organised in-service programs in the schools on the teaching of reading. Most answered that opportunities for discussion on the teaching of reading occurred incidentally in grade meetings that were held regularly. Approximately one-third of the schools had organised some form of specific school in-service program on reading or the language arts. One-fifth of the schools reported that they had developed a school policy booklet on the teaching of reading. The general impression from the interviews was that all the possibilities of induction and school-based in-service reading courses had not been, as yet, fully investigated by many administrators.

## 6. LIAISON BETWEEN COLLEGE AND PRACTISING SCHOOL

### 6.1 Written Communication: Opinions of Lecturers:

As the college's associated practising schools fulfil a complementary role in the training of student teachers to teach reading, questions were asked about the liaison between the two bodies.

Lecturers reported that the colleges had used various methods of improving liaison and co-ordination between themselves and practising school. For example, all colleges had published a practice teaching guide for principals and supervising teachers. Generally, however, very little information was included concerning the teaching of reading specifically, for the guide was meant only as a general orientation to students' practice teaching. It was regularly revised by an advisory committee which usually consisted of members from both college and practising school.

### 6.2 Written Communication: Opinions of Practising School Personnel:

Supervising teachers were asked 'Does the college supply any details concerning a student's stage of training in the teaching of reading?'. With the exception of one college, supervising teachers reported that they had not received any information specifically on the teaching of reading from their respective college.

The main written communication received from the colleges was a practice teaching guide which was more a general orientation for those involved in the practice teaching program, rather than a detailed account of the different curriculum areas. Administrators also stated that they received a list from the colleges which included the names of students and the grades previously taught in practice periods. Four of the colleges had also sent to the Principal of the practising school, a copy of the college handbook from which the details of college subjects could be ascertained. Only one college supplied a handbook to each supervising teacher. It is interesting to note that when supervising teachers were asked what kind of written information they would like from their respective colleges, the most frequent request was for more detail concerning the content of college programs for the teaching of reading. Supervising teachers felt that such information could improve the co-ordination of training in the teaching of reading between college and practising school.

### 6.3 Personal Contact: Opinions of Lecturers:

Lecturers stated that occasional discussions were held with practising school personnel at the college, though not specifically on the teaching of reading. Most discussion, however, occurred when lecturers visited the school to assess students during their practice teaching. Lecturers reported that the system was such that it was really left to chance whether a student was seen teaching a reading lesson by his/her lecturer

during the practice. The massive amount of logistics and time required also militated against the assessment of all students' actual abilities to teach reading to children while at practising school (1). Workshops and case studies had been used instead.

6.4 Personal Contact: Opinions of Practising School Personnel:

Supervising teachers and administrators were asked 'Is there any discussion between lecturers and school staff concerning student teachers' practice in the teaching of reading?'. Generally, the answer was 'No, not specifically on the teaching of reading'. The main liaison occurred when the college lecturer came out to assess the student teacher and discussion usually took place at the end of a student's lesson. Supervising teachers stated that the lecturers were generally more concerned with such areas as discipline or overall teaching ability rather than any specific curriculum area. It was mostly left to chance whether the student's lesson was a reading lesson and it was felt by many teachers that when choosing a lesson to be taken for a lecturer, a student teacher would probably prepare a more creative type lesson such as Drama, Science or Creative Writing, rather than a reading lesson. Supervising teachers also reported that the visiting lecturer's expertise might not be in the reading field. Generally, the type of lesson which the student took and the lecturer's field of interest did not appear to be well co-ordinated.

If very little personal liaison was reported on the role of supervising teachers in the normal school situation, were there any in-service courses offered on the role of supervising teachers in the teaching of reading at the college? To this question, the unanimous answer was no. In the past, however, college staffs had held occasional meetings with administrators and/or supervising teachers concerning the role of the practising school. The topics discussed were mainly of a general nature and the teaching of reading had not been raised specifically.

From this section on liaison, it may be concluded that administrators and supervisors felt that the liaison between college and practising school concerning the teaching of reading had been minimal. There appeared also to be a lack of communication, generally, between the two training bodies.

## PRE-SCHOOL AND SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION

While most of the survey concentrated on primary teacher training, the opinion of lecturers training secondary teachers were sought in Phase I and also the opinions of supervising teachers training pre-school teachers were ascertained in Phase II.

### Secondary Teacher Education: Phase I

The biggest issue raised in the transcripts concerning secondary teacher training was whether or not reading courses were actually required to be undertaken by students.

In three out of the four secondary training bodies, lecturers reported that reading components were only compulsory for those students who would be English teachers. Only in one college had a compulsory 28 hour 'Reading in the Content Areas' course been introduced for all three-year pre-service secondary student teachers. **Recent correspondence between the Board and these teacher training organisations indicates that the situation has changed since the 1977 interviews. In 1979, all four secondary teacher training institutions offered a literacy, language and reading unit which was compulsory for most secondary student teachers irrespective of their teaching area. For further details, see Section III.**

(1) As stated above, four colleges are attempting to overcome this problem.

Pre-school Teacher Education: Phase II

The three pre-school supervising teachers who were interviewed spoke of many problems similar to those faced in primary schools. The pre-school supervisors, however, set student teachers more 'lessons' in this area than their primary colleagues. They reported that a language or pre-reading activity was set every day and at least some form of notes was required. The types of activities included auditory and visual discrimination games, story directions, and language development exercises. Most activities revolved around a theme and all subject areas were interrelated and treated as a total language experience.

## DISCUSSION: THE TEACHER EDUCATORS

### 1. INSTRUCTION AND PRACTICE IN THE TEACHING OF READING AND LANGUAGE SKILLS

In Phase I, lecturers strongly advocated an extension of the compulsory pre-service hours and also an increase in in-service courses devoted to the teaching of reading and associated language skills. Although it could be argued that an increase in the number of hours devoted to reading and language courses does not necessarily mean better teacher education in this area, it is certainly one measuring instrument that may be used to indicate the priority given to reading and language by teacher training institutions. A reading of Section III of this publication reveals the increasing amount of attention that has been given to this area and, therefore, no further elaboration will be made here.

Further comment, however, should be made about the pre-service instruction and practice in the teaching of reading at primary practising schools.

As may be observed from the results section, the importance placed on the setting of reading lessons by supervising teachers appears to decrease as the school level increases. Furthermore, the types of lessons set in the upper school (mainly comprehension and study type skills) suggest that a student's practice in the teaching of reading is mainly directed towards the needs of the majority of the class. By concentrating on these types of lessons, a student might come to regard the 'lower' word recognition skills as unnecessary for at least some readers in the upper school. Thus a student may be influenced to choose the reading skills to be taught according to a child's year of schooling, rather than his or her individual stage of development.

Such an inference is reinforced by the result that there appears to be very little supervised student practice of diagnostic tests and evaluation techniques while at practising school. The finding that only approximately a quarter of the upper school supervising teachers ever set a written prepared lesson that is directed towards a group of children, also adds weight to the argument. It could be concluded that if very little emphasis is placed on written prepared group lessons, it is to be expected that, generally, very little importance would be placed on the teaching of reading to the minority group of under-achievers in the upper school.

The results in the lower school are also cause for comment. The emphasis on setting lessons that mainly involve the teaching of word recognition skills may influence students to think that the teaching of comprehension is less important in the lower grades.

In conclusion, the number and types of lessons that supervising teachers set student teachers, suggest that as far as a student's teaching practice is concerned, reading generally does not appear to be regarded as a developmental process. Such a suggestion is important, especially in the light of the emphasis placed on this aspect by lecturers interviewed in Phase I of this survey. They reported that the major emphasis in content (of college teaching of reading courses) was on the developmental aspect of reading, i.e. reading was to be taught right through the system. In this respect, then, it may be concluded that an apparent gap exists between the aims of college lecturers and the actual teaching of reading practice a student generally receives at practising school.

## 2. ORGANISATION OF TRAINING AT COLLEGE AND PRACTICING SCHOOL

### 2.1 Organisation of courses at college:

One of the biggest problems that may be noted from the results section is the question of how a teaching of reading course should be organised within a pre-service training program.

First on this topic, there was a difference of opinion expressed by lecturers concerning whether reading courses should form only part of a language arts curriculum studies course or be treated as a separate unit. This organisational question is compounded when we look at whether or not all the contributing disciplines should be integrated in reading courses, and not just other language arts.

It is interesting to note that this theme is present also in the 1975 Bullock Committee report (1). Members of this committee believed that the fragmentation of the various aspects or disciplines such as child development, classroom organisation and practice teaching had actually prevented theory from being linked with practice within a coherent intellectual framework.

This perhaps brings us to the second problem expressed by lecturers concerning the organisation of teaching of reading instruction - the matching of theory with practice. In the results section, it was reported that, while alternative methods were being used in some colleges to remedy the situation, generally lecturers believed that the integration of college teaching of reading instruction with the normal practising period was minimal.

In some respects, these opinions are similar to those expressed by supervising teachers and school administrators. They felt that student teachers brought to the school situation very little practical knowledge of how to actually teach reading in the classroom situation. Given the opinions expressed above, perhaps it is not surprising to find that when supervising teachers and administrators were asked how they would like to see teaching of reading courses organised, they answered that curriculum content and methodology were most important.

### 2.2 Organisation of training at practising school:

As reported in the results section, school personnel did not believe that the present practising school experience was as valuable as it could be. As also noted, their suggestions for improvement of the practice period focussed on the difficulties of giving a student practice in the teaching of an ongoing skill. As with other skill subjects, an 'isolated' reading lesson does not appear to be sufficient to enable students to gain enough insight into the reading process so as to facilitate an integration of theory and practice.

On this topic, lecturers were similarly concerned. The alternative approaches to teaching practice offered by some colleges, which aim to close the theory-practice gap, only serve to highlight the problems associated with the normal practice period. Some lecturers' concern about the lack of control and knowledge of what is actually happening in the normal practice period is also worthy of note here.

Finally, it is important to mention the responses of school administrators concerning induction, the training period that lies between the initial pre-service qualification and the possible completion of in-service qualifications. Although the results show that induction of beginning teachers has been considered at least to some degree by the schools, this second stage of teacher education warrants further investigation, as do school-based in-service courses. (Induction is treated further in the Phase III results and in a separate research project being conducted by the Board.)

(1) A Language for Life. Report of the Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the Chairmanship of Sir Alan Bullock, FBA. HMSO, London, 1975.

## 3. LIAISON BETWEEN COLLEGE AND PRACTISING SCHOOL

In Phase I, lecturers reported that while they had used various methods of improvi liaison between themselves and practising school, the system was such that it was le to chance, for example, whether or not a student was seen teaching a reading less by his/her lecturer during the normal practice period.

As stated in Phase II, school administrators and supervisors also felt that, generally, the liaison between college and practising school concerning the teaching of reading had been minimal. The impression received from the Phase II transcripts was that there appeared also to be a lack of communication, generally, between the two training bodies.

In some respects, such an apparent lack of liaison could be said to be related to many of the other opinions held by school personnel concerning the college preparation of teachers to teach reading. To explain further, during the interviews, both supervising teachers and administrators generally showed in their answers, a negative attitude towards their respective college. Whether or not such negative opinions are justified is perhaps less important here than the fact that they do exist. In some respects, their actual existence could well be taken as merely an illustration of the liaison and communication problem between college and school. Perhaps one of the most important implications that arises from Phases I and II is that there is a need for greater dialogue between college and practising school concerning their respective roles in the training of teachers to teach reading. It will be interesting to observe the progress of the alternative approaches to teaching practice with which some colleges are experimenting.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: BEGINNING PRIMARY TEACHERS

The following paragraphs outline the results of Phase III: Questionnaire and Interviews with Beginning Teachers (March-April 1979). For ease of comparison, the results reported in table form are percentages calculated on the total number of questionnaires returned (N = 215). A 'No Answer' column records the number (in brackets) and the percentage of the total sample who did not answer a particular question.

## 1. PREPARATION AT COLLEGE

### 1.1 Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, beginning teachers were first of all asked their opinions concerning the amount of coursework that was required at college in four main areas: foundation courses; curriculum content and methodology of primary school subjects; 'personal development' or 'liberal studies'; and elective courses.

From Table 1, it may be observed that while the majority felt that the amount of 'personal development' and elective courses were 'about right', almost half (49.3 percent) felt that 'too much' time was spent on foundation courses. More importantly, perhaps, 82.3 percent of respondents felt that there was too little coursework in curriculum content and methodology of primary school subjects.

Table 1 Opinions concerning amount of coursework (N = 215)

| Area | Too Much | About Right | Too Little | No Opinion | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foundation Ed. Courses (e.g. Ed. Psy., Theories of Ed., Phil. of Ed., Soc. of Ed., Child Development etc.) | 49.3 | 44.7 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 0.9(2) |
| Curriculum Content, Methodology of Primary School Subjects | 0.5 | 16.7 | 82.3 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Personal Dev. or Liberal Studies Courses (e.g. Art, Modern Lit., Maths, Biol., European History) | 19.1 | 68.4 | 9.3 | 3.3 | 0.0 |
| Elective Courses | 5.6 | 66.5 | 26.5 | 0.5 | 0.9(2) |

Table 2 shows a breakdown of beginning teachers' opinions on their preparation in these various curriculum courses. While most curriculum areas had their share of negative responses, 'reading' was one of only three areas (the others being spelling and grammar) where over half of the respondents felt that they had received 'poor' or 'very poor' preparation.

As can be seen also from Table 2, reading overwhelmingly received first preference choice (48.4 percent) when beginning teachers were asked to write down the three subjects about which they most needed to know more.

Table 2 Opinions concerning college preparation in curriculum areas and preferences where knowledge is most needed (N = 215)

| | Opinion | | | | | | | Preference | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Area | Very Good | Good | Av. | Poor | Very Poor | Not Studied | No Answer | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| Music | 19.1 | 27.0 | 30.2 | 15.8 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.5(1) | 6.5 | 5.1 | 11.2 |
| Maths | 8.8 | 26.5 | 29.3 | 25.6 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.5(1) | 18.1 | 18.1 | 7.9 |
| Written Express.(*) | 1.4 | 10.7 | 34.4 | 34.0 | 11.6 | 6.0 | 1.9(4) | 2.8 | 11.2 | 10.2 |
| Reading (*) | 4.2 | 15.8 | 23.3 | 35.8 | 19.1 | 1.4 | 0.5(1) | 48.4 | 13.0 | 7.9 |
| Art | 11.6 | 34.9 | 37.7 | 8.8 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 1.9(4) | 0.9 | 5.6 | 0.9 |
| Spelling (*) | 0.9 | 4.7 | 21.9 | 34.9 | 22.8 | 14.0 | 0.9(2) | 1.9 | 11.2 | 8.8 |
| Oral Comm. (*) | 5.6 | 23.7 | 39.5 | 21.4 | 7.4 | 1.4 | 0.9(2) | 1.9 | 5.1 | 6.5 |
| Phys. Ed. | 20.9 | 42.3 | 27.4 | 7.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 2.8 | 4.7 |
| Social Studies | 9.8 | 31.6 | 37.7 | 12.6 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 0.9(2) | 6.5 | 5.6 | 13.0 |
| Science | 11.2 | 32.1 | 40.0 | 11.2 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 0.5(1) | 1.9 | 4.7 | 7.4 |
| Grammar (*) | 1.4 | 5.1 | 17.7 | 31.6 | 22.3 | 21.4 | 0.5(1) | 7.4 | 13.0 | 12.6 |
| All of Language Arts | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.3 | 2.8 | 0.5 |
| No Answer | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0.5(1) | 2.3(5) | 8.4(18) |

(*) It is recognised that these subject areas are integrated within the total Language Arts area. Since Language Arts is such a wide curriculum area, however, it was decided to separate them, perhaps artificially, for the purpose of this survey.

In Part II of the questionnaire (specifically on the teaching of reading), beginning teachers were asked their opinions on the amount of coursework in reading at college. From Table 3 it may be observed that 69.8 percent thought that the amount of compulsory coursework in the teaching of reading was 'too little' and 57.7 percent felt the same about the amount of elective courses offered in this area.

Table 3 Opinions concerning coursework in 'the teaching of reading' at college (N = 215)

| | Too Much | About Right | Too Little | No Opinion | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compulsory Coursework | 3.7 | 24.2 | 69.8 | 1.4 | 0.9(2) |
| Elective Coursework | 0.5 | 33.5 | 57.7 | 4.7 | 3.8(8) |

Beginning teachers were asked the number of compulsory and elective courses that they actually studied, in which the teaching of reading was an integral and substantial component. These results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Number of compulsory and elective courses undertaken in which 'the teaching of reading' was an integral and substantial component (N = 215)

| | None | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Compulsory Courses | 3.7 | 38.6 | 32.1 | 16.7 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 1.4(3) |
| Elective Courses | 63.3 | 28.4 | 7.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5(1) |

When the results of Tables 3 and 4 are observed alongside each other, it is interesting to note that while over 70 percent answered that they had undertaken either one or two compulsory 'reading' courses (38.6 percent and 32.1 percent respectively), the majority (69.8 percent) believed that the amount of compulsory coursework was 'too little'. A crosstabulation of the relevant variables (Appendix J.1) reveals that 45 percent of those who answered 'too little' had actually undertaken one compulsory 'reading' course (32.1 percent of total sample). More importantly, it may be observed that 32.2 percent of those who answered 'too little' had undertaken two compulsory courses (23.0 percent of the total sample). These respondents account for 69.6 percent of all those who had undertaken two compulsory courses. For these beginning teachers, two compulsory courses in reading was not thought to be sufficient ('about right').

Also interesting is the finding that, while 57.7 percent of respondents felt that the number of 'reading' elective courses offered was 'too little', 63.3 percent of respondents did not actually choose to undertake such a course. (1978 handbooks indicate that most colleges offered at least one elective in this area.) This result is made more interesting by a crosstabulation of relevant variables (Appendix J.2) which reveals that 62.5 percent of those who did not undertake a reading elective felt that 'too little' elective coursework in this area had been offered. These respondents account for 38.8 percent of the total sample.

These results may be interpreted in the following way. First, the finding that 63.3 percent of respondents did not actually choose to undertake a 'reading' course gives some indication of the lack of popularity of elective courses 'in which the teaching of reading is an integral and substantial component'. This result also strengthens the position of those people who have advocated the need for compulsory 'reading' courses. Second, the result that there was a large number of respondents (38.8 percent of total sample) who did not undertake an elective and also felt that the number of electives offered was 'too little', suggests the need to either increase the number of 'reading' electives or to provide a greater diversity of content in existing electives, sufficient

Table 5 Opinions concerning college preparation in various areas of reading and preferences where knowledge is most needed (N = 215)

| Area | Opinion | | | | | | | Preference | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Very Good | Good | Ave. | Poor | Very Poor | Not Studied | No Answer | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| The psychology of reading process | 7.0 | 18.1 | 37.7 | 22.8 | 6.0 | 7.9 | 0.5(1) | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| The contents of the Language Arts Curriculum Guide | 3.3 | 13.0 | 27.4 | 33.0 | 19.5 | 3.7 | 0.0 | 7.9 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| How to teach readiness for beginning reading | 10.2 | 26.5 | 25.6 | 22.3 | 10.7 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 3.7 |
| How to teach sight vocabulary | 3.7 | 14.4 | 30.7 | 34.0 | 10.7 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 2.8 | 5.6 | 2.3 |
| How to teach phonic skills | 3.7 | 14.9 | 30.2 | 34.0 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 9.8 | 7.4 | 5.6 |
| How to teach meanings of words | 0.9 | 8.4 | 25.6 | 43.3 | 12.1 | 9.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 3.3 |
| How to teach comprehension skills | 2.8 | 14.4 | 29.3 | 36.7 | 11.6 | 5.1 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| How to teach study skills | 0.5 | 8.4 | 18.6 | 45.6 | 15.8 | 11.2 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 1.4 |
| How to devise a reading program from available resources | 2.8 | 6.0 | 22.3 | 40.5 | 17.7 | 10.7 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 9.8 | 4.7 |
| How to use the reading scheme/s in your classroom | 3.7 | 16.3 | 20.5 | 32.1 | 18.6 | 8.8 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 9.3 | 7.4 |
| How to organise a class into different reading groups | 1.4 | 8.8 | 27.0 | 37.2 | 16.7 | 8.4 | 0.5(1) | 7.9 | 8.4 | 1.4 |
| How to manage simultaneously the reading groups in a class | 0.5 | 3.7 | 14.0 | 43.7 | 24.7 | 13.5 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 16.3 | 7.4 |
| How to individualise reading instruction | 0.9 | 6.5 | 23.3 | 41.4 | 18.6 | 8.4 | 0.9(2) | 4.7 | 4.7 | 13.0 |
| How to select appropriate reading material in Social Studies, Maths, Science, etc. | 1.4 | 7.4 | 25.6 | 35.3 | 18.6 | 11.6 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.8 | 1.9 |
| How to determine the readability of reading material | 5.1 | 16.7 | 24.2 | 29.8 | 16.7 | 7.4 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 4.7 |
| How to select and administer reading tests | 11.2 | 27.0 | 33.0 | 17.2 | 8.4 | 3.3 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 1.9 |
| How to construct appropriate reading tests | 7.0 | 13.0 | 24.2 | 33.0 | 14.9 | 7.4 | 0.5(1) | 0.0 | 2.8 | 3.7 |
| How to diagnose reading problems | 7.4 | 22.8 | 28.8 | 24.7 | 13.5 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 4.7 | 7.4 |
| How to plan and provide appropriate remedial instruction | 5.6 | 17.2 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 17.2 | 6.0 | 0.0 | 6.1 | 5.6 | 8.8 |
| How to promote an interest in reading | 4.7 | 26.0 | 38.6 | 20.5 | 7.9 | 1.9 | 0.5(1) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.4 |
| A knowledge of the role of remedial/resource teachers | 3.7 | 14.9 | 26.5 | 34.0 | 12.6 | 7.9 | 0.5(1) | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| A knowledge of the role of guidance officers | 2.3 | 9.8 | 22.3 | 35.8 | 18.1 | 11.2 | 0.5(1) | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| No Answer | | | | | | | | 8.8 (19) | 8.8 (19) | 13.0 (28) |

at least to motivate similarly minded respondents to undertake an elective course in this area.

More detailed opinions were sought concerning beginning teachers' preparation in 22 various component areas of reading. The results are presented in Table 5. It will be observed that the areas in which the highest number of beginning teachers felt they had received either 'good' or 'very good' preparation were the following: how to select and administer reading tests (38.2 percent); how to teach readiness for beginning reading (36.7 percent); how to promote an interest in reading (30.7 percent); and how to diagnose reading problems (30.2 percent). On the other hand, the areas where the majority (over 55 percent) felt they had received either 'poor' or 'very poor' preparation were: how to manage simultaneously the reading groups in a class (68.4 percent); how to teach study skills (61.4 percent); how to individualise reading instruction (60 percent); how to devise a reading program from available resources (58.2 percent); and how to teach meanings of words (55.4 percent).

Note should be made of the relatively high percentages of respondents who answered that they had not studied certain reading areas: how to manage simultaneously the reading groups in a class (13.5 percent); how to select appropriate reading material in Social Studies, Maths, Science, etc. (11.6 percent); a knowledge of the role of guidance officers (11.2 percent); how to teach study skills (11.2 percent); and how to devise a reading program from available resources (10.7 percent).

It may be observed also from Table 5 that when beginning teachers were asked the reading components about which they needed to know more, the most frequently written preferences were: how to manage simultaneously the reading groups in a class (first preference of 15.4 percent, second preference of 16.3 percent); and how to devise a reading program from available resources (first preference of 15.4 percent, second preference of 9.8 percent). It is perhaps appropriate to conclude that while Table 5 shows that beginning teachers feel 'insecure' in many areas of reading, the major concern appears to be with general organisational and planning aspects that apply to the regular classroom.

### 1.2 Group Interview:

The opinions expressed in the questionnaire were also reflected in the group interviews. Beginning teachers generally expressed dissatisfaction with the way in which colleges had prepared them in the curriculum areas. When asked why so many of them had particularly chosen reading about which they needed to know more, answers centred around the general theme of lack of knowledge of where to begin in reading. Beginning teachers appeared confused concerning the organisational aspects (especially group work) and the specific steps in how to actually teach reading as against just supervising it.

## 2. PREPARATION AT PRACTISING SCHOOL

### 2.1 Questionnaire:

Beginning teachers were first of all asked how well college courses were co-ordinated with the practice they were given at practising school. Table 6 shows that only 12.6 percent thought that co-ordination was 'good' or 'very good', whereas 48.4 percent considered co-ordination to be either 'poor' or 'very poor'.

Table 6 Opinions on co-ordination between college and practising school (N = 215)

| Very Good Co-ordination | Good Co-ordination | Average Co-ordination | Poor Co-ordination | Very Poor Co-ordination |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.9 | 10.7 | 39.1 | 33.5 | 14.9 |

Beginning teachers were also asked about the amount of time they spent at practising school. Table 7 compares this result with the amount of practice received in the teaching of reading. In both cases, it clearly shows that the majority of beginning teachers felt that 'too little' time was devoted to these areas.

**Table 7** Opinions concerning time spent at practising school, in general, and the amount of practice received in the teaching of reading (N = 215)

| | Too Much | About Right | Too Little | No Opinion | No Practice | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Time spent at prac. school | 0.5 | 31.6 | 67.4 | 0.0 | - | 0.5(1) |
| Practice in the teaching of reading at prac. school | 0.0 | 14.0 | 72.1 | 0.5 | 13.5 | 0.0 |

While this is so, Table 8 illustrates that the majority of beginning teachers felt that the help that they had received generally at practising school was of good (43.3 percent) or very good quality (24.7 percent). Table 8 also shows, however, a less positive result when questions were asked concerning the help that beginning teachers had received from classroom supervisors and school administrators specifically in the teaching of reading.

**Table 8** Opinions concerning the quality of help at practising school, in general, and from classroom supervisors and administrators specifically in the teaching of reading (N = 215)

| | | Very Good | Good | Av. | Poor | Very Poor | No Opinion | No Prac. | No Help | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Quality of help at practising school generally | | 24.7 | 43.3 | 25.6 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 0.9 | - | - | 0.0 |
| HELP IN TEACHING OF READING | Classroom Supervisor: Lower Primary | 7.0 | 16.7 | 30.7 | 21.9 | 9.8 | 2.3 | 9.3 | - | 2.3(5) |
| | Classroom Supervisor: Middle Primary | 5.1 | 7.9 | 35.3 | 24.7 | 14.0 | 1.9 | 10.7 | - | 0.5(1) |
| | Classroom Supervisor: Upper Primary | 2.8 | 7.0 | 27.0 | 25.1 | 19.5 | 1.9 | 15.8 | - | 0.9(2) |
| | School Administrators | 2.3 | 6.0 | 24.7 | 27.4 | 12.1 | 0.5 | - | 26.0 | 0.9(2) |

Further details were sought concerning the 'when' and 'where' of respondents' practising school experience. Beginning teachers were asked: 'During what year of your teacher training did you practise teaching in the following classes?' The results of this question, shown in Table 9, are interesting for several reasons.

First, the table shows that not all respondents practised teaching in every grade, even though a beginning teacher may be appointed to any grade from one to seven. Under this system, then, it is probable that some beginning teachers will be appointed to grades in which they have not practised during their teacher training. A cross tabulation of relevant variables (Appendix J.3) exemplifies this problem and has particular relevance for the teaching of reading in the lower grades. It shows that five out of 40 teachers (12.5 percent) in the sample who were appointed to Year Two in their first teaching position, did not actually practise teaching in that grade. The actual number reported here is small, but it does point out that there are some beginning teachers who are teaching classes with which they have not had previous practising school experience.

The second major point that arises from an observation of Table 9 is the comparatively high percentage of the total sample (34.4 percent) who practised teaching in Year One in the first year of their teacher training.(1) This raises an important question as far as the teaching of reading is concerned. On the one hand, it could be argued that students who practise in the lower grades in the first year of their training will have some basis to judge the development of the reading process in later grades. On the other hand, the 'educational immaturity' of students in Year One and the knowledge that fewer lessons are taught then may mitigate against a student gaining the most from the experience. This area perhaps requires further investigation.

Table 9 Primary Class and Year of teacher training in which teaching practice was undertaken (N = 215)

| Class | Year/s of teacher training when practice was undertaken | | | | | | | No practice in this class | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1,2 | 2,3 | 1,3 | 1,2,3 | | |
| Year One | 34.4 | 18.1 | 13.5 | 5.1 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 14.4 | 6.0(13) |
| Year Two | 25.1 | 14.9 | 22.3 | 1.9 | 6.0 | 4.2 | 0.5 | 16.7 | 8.4(18) |
| Year Three | 20.5 | 20.9 | 14.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 21.4 | 11.2(24) |
| Year Four | 15.3 | 17.7 | 24.7 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 0.9 | 22.3 | 7.0(15) |
| Year Five | 13.5 | 25.6 | 21.9 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 1.4 | 16.7 | 8.4(18) |
| Year Six | 27.0 | 17.7 | 20.5 | 6.5 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 11.6 | 8.4(18) |
| Year Seven | 25.6 | 20.5 | 19.1 | 4.7 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 2.3 | 9.3 | 4.2(9) |

Finally, an attempt was made in the questionnaire to judge the popularity of reading as a subject to teach at practising school. Beginning teachers were asked what subjects they most and least enjoyed teaching at practising school. The results are shown in Table 10. Of particular interest to this project is the finding that only 0.5 percent (one person) thought that reading was the most enjoyable subject to teach (2), whereas 29.8 percent felt that Mathematics (the other major basic skill) was the most enjoyable. On the other hand, only 5.1 percent found it the least enjoyable (as against

(1) When the 'No answer' and 'No practice' respondents are deleted from the calculations, this percentage rises to 43.3 percent (of those who answered that they practised teaching in Grade 1).

(2) It should be noted here that this percentage (0.5) was misprinted as 5 percent in a previously published research summary which was prepared for the Board's first conference on 26 May 1979.

13.5 percent for Maths). In comparison to Maths then, beginning teachers appeared to take a neutral stance as regards their affective commitment to the teaching of reading at practising school. (*)

Table 10 Opinions on the subject that was most and least enjoyable to teach at practising school (N = 215)

| Subject | Most Enjoyable | Least Enjoyable |
|---|---|---|
| Music | 11.6 | 29.8 |
| Maths | 29.8 | 13.5 |
| Written Expression | 5.1 | 0.5 |
| Reading | 0.5 | 5.1 |
| Art | 7.9 | 3.7 |
| Spelling | 0.5 | 1.4 |
| Oral Communication | 2.3 | 0.9 |
| Phys. Ed. | 10.7 | 6.1 |
| Social Studies | 13.0 | 16.3 |
| Science | 12.1 | 8.8 |
| Grammar | [illegible]C | 11.2 |
| All of Language Arts | [illegible].1 | 0.9 |
| No Answer | 0.9(2) | 2.3(5) |

Results of the questionnaire also show that reading was not very high on the list of subjects chosen to teach for a visiting lecturer. When beginning teachers were asked how many times they had taught a reading lesson for the purpose of a lecturer's observation and assessment, 73.5 percent answered 'none' (Table 11a). This is despite the finding that most respondents at one time or another had the choice of what lesson to present for a lecturer. Only 14.9 percent stated that they had no choice (Table 11b).

Table 11a Number of reading lessons taught at practising school for the purpose of a lecturer's observation and assessment (N = 215)

| None | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73.5 | 17.2 | 5.6 | 2.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.5(1) |

Table 11b Opinions concerning ability to choose the type of lesson to be assessed by the visiting lecturer (N = 215)

| Always | Often | Sometimes | Seldom | Never | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.6 | 24.2 | 31.2 | 16.7 | 14.9 | 1.4(3) |

(*) As may be observed, this comment may not be confined to reading only. Spelling, Oral and Written Expression fall into similar categories.

2.2 Group Interview:

In the group interviews, beginning teachers were asked to elaborate on the help that they had received in reading. Generally, beginning teachers stated that they had been given a little practice in teaching reading lessons in the lower grades (picture talks, sight vocabulary, etc.) and also in the middle and upper grades (mostly comprehension lessons). The main activities in reading, however, appeared to be either listening to a group reading a story or supervising children who were completing card work or other reading exercises.

## 3. PREPARATION IN 'FIRST YEAR OUT'

3.1 Questionnaire:

At the beginning of the questionnaire, beginning teachers were asked where they thought they had learnt the most teaching skills: college, practising school, or in school since employment. As may be seen from Table 12, the most frequent response was, perhaps not unexpectedly, 'in school since employment' (48.8 percent).

Table 12 Opinions on where beginning teachers felt they learnt the most teaching skills (N = 215)

| College | Practising school | In school since employment | Other (*) | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7.4 | 38.6 | 48.8 | 3.3 | 1.9(4) |

On the topic of 'first year out' in particular, beginning teachers were first asked whether or not they had visited the school to which they were appointed before the commencement of first term. As may be seen from Table 13, only 7.4 percent of respondents did not visit their school. Approximately 70 percent thought that the visit was at least of some help and almost 30 percent believed it to have been either of great or very great help.

Table 13 Opinions on helpfulness of school visit prior to the commencement of first term (N = 215)

| Very Great Help | Great Help | Some Help | Little Help | No Help | No Opinion | No Visit | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11.6 | 18.1 | 40.9 | 15.8 | 4.7 | 0.0 | 7.4 | 1.4(3) |

Beginning teachers were asked also about the help that they had received in their 'first months of teaching'. It may be observed from Table 14a (over leaf) that the types of help in which a majority of respondents felt were of 'great' or 'very great help' were the following: advice from other classroom teacher/s (71.1 percent); consulting various text books (60 percent); and advice from the principal (50.3 percent). And the types of help in which the highest number of beginning teachers (over 30 percent) thought were 'of little' or 'of no help': consulting lesson notes prepared for practising

(*) Of those respondents in the 'other' column, 2.5 percent (5 persons) ticked both school and prac., 0.5 (1 person) ticked both School and College, and 0.5 percent (1 person) answered that her general life's experience had taught her the most skills. (Total - 3.3 percent)

school (32.5 percent); attendance at regular school staff meetings (32 percent); and consulting material, notes, etc. provided by college during training (30.7 percent).

Table 14a Opinions concerning help received in the first months of teaching (N = 215)

| Help received | Very Great Help | Great Help | Some Help | Little Help | No Help | Not available Not Occurred | No Opinion | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advice from principal | 19.1 | 31.2 | 34.9 | 7.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 0.9(2) |
| Advice from other administrators | 13.5 | 21.4 | 24.7 | 7.9 | 0.9 | 28.8 | 1.4 | 1.4(3) |
| Advice from other classroom teacher/s | 36.7 | 34.4 | 21.9 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.4(3) |
| Advice from resource or remedial teacher/s | 12.6 | 23.3 | 23.3 | 7.0 | 3.7 | 27.9 | 1.4 | 0.9(2) |
| Advice from guidance officer/s | 1.9 | 4.7 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 7.9 | 67.4 | 2.8 | 0.9(2) |
| Advice from college lecturer/s | 0.5 | 5.1 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 7.9 | 69.8 | 3.7 | 0.5(1) |
| Observing demonstration lessons | 6.0 | 7.4 | 10.2 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 65.6 | 0.5 | 0.5(1) |
| Attendance at regular school staff meetings | 8.4 | 13.0 | 40.5 | 16.7 | 15.3 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 0.9(2) |
| Attendance at school meetings for beginning teachers | 8.4 | 19.1 | 19.1 | 10.2 | 5.6 | 35.3 | 1.9 | 0.5(1) |
| Attendance at school workshops for beginning teachers | 3.7 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 4.7 | 2.3 | 73.5 | 2.8 | 0.5(1) |
| Working on school curriculum committees | 2.3 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 68.8 | 3.3 | 0.9(2) |
| Consulting various curriculum guides | 8.4 | 35.8 | 40.9 | 8.8 | 1.9 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 0.5(1) |
| Consulting various 'text' books | 16.7 | 43.3 | 31.2 | 6.5 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.0 |
| Consulting lesson notes prepared for practising school | 6.0 | 11.6 | 42.3 | 19.5 | 13.0 | 6.5 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| Consulting material, notes etc. provided by college during training | 3.7 | 14.9 | 48.4 | 23.7 | 7.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Using resource material you prepared during training | 10.2 | 24.2 | 29.8 | 22.3 | 7.4 | 4.7 | 0.5 | 0.9(2) |
| Attendance at a local teachers' centre | 1.9 | 6.5 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 5.1 | 60.0 | 6.0 | 0.5(1) |
| Visiting other schools | 0.9 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 86.5 | 3.7 | 0.9(2) |
| Attendance at meeting/s of a professional association | 0.5 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 81.9 | 6.5 | 0.5(1) |

It is important to note also the large percentage of teachers who answered that many types of help either were not available or had not occurred. Of particular interest at the school level: attendance at school workshops for beginning teachers (73.5 percent); working on school curriculum committees (68.8 percent); observing demonstration

lessons (65.6 percent); and attendance at school meetings for beginning teachers (35.3 percent).

Also interesting is the finding that so many beginning teachers had not, in their first months of teaching, taken advantage of (or known about?) two valuable professional resources: attendance at meeting/s of a professional association (81.9 percent); and attendance at a local teachers' centre (60 percent).

On the teaching of reading specifically, opinions were asked concerning the help that beginning teachers had received in the area since the commencement of duty. The results are shown in Table 14b. When these results are compared with similar variables in Table 14a, it will be observed, for example, that while the school principal and experienced classroom teachers, were helpful generally, there was apparently less advice forthcoming on the specific topic of reading.

Table 14b Opinions concerning help received in the teaching of reading since commencement of duty (N = 215)

| Help received | Very Great Help | Great Help | Some Help | Little Help | No Help | Not available Not occurred | No Opinion | No Answer |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Advice from principal | 4.2 | 10.7 | 27.4 | 12.1 | 11.2 | 28.4 | 3.3 | 2.8(6) |
| Advice from other administrators | 6.0 | 9.3 | 13.0 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 49.8 | 0.9 | 2.8(6) |
| Advice from other classroom teachers | 23.3 | 25.1 | 27.4 | 11.2 | 2.3 | 7.9 | 0.5 | 2.3(5) |
| Advice from resource/ remedial teachers | 6.5 | 14.9 | 13.0 | 9.3 | 7.9 | 44.7 | 0.9 | 2.8(6) |
| Advice from guidance officers | 1.4 | 1.4 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 9.8 | 74.9 | 1.9 | 2.8(6) |
| Advice from college lecturers | 1.4 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 2.8 | 7.4 | 77.7 | 0.9 | 4.2(9) |

3.2 Group Interview:

The opinions expressed in the questionnaire were also reflected in the group interviews. Generally, beginning teachers stated that they had not been given any systematic introduction to the teaching of reading. They had mainly learnt a little about the scheme or program that was operating in the school from an experienced colleague and by a 'trial and error' approach in the classroom.

Perhaps it is appropriate to conclude this section with how beginning teachers felt about the teaching of various subjects in their first year out. These results are shown in Table 15 (over leaf). Of particular interest is the result that when beginning teachers were asked in the questionnaire what had been the most difficult subject to teach to their own class, the most frequent response was reading (27.9 percent).

Table 15 Opinions on the subject that was most/least enjoyable and easiest/most difficult to teach to own class (N = 215)

| Subject | Most Enjoyable | Least Enjoyable | Easiest to teach | Most difficult to teach |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Music | 8.8 | 16.3 | 5.1 | 9.3 |
| Maths | 31.6 | 9.3 | 25.1 | 20.5 |
| Written Expression | 4.7 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 4.7 |
| Reading | 4.7 | 9.8 | 1.4 | 27.9 |
| Art | 6.5 | 4.7 | 17.2 | 0.5 |
| Spelling | 0.5 | 6.5 | 10.2 | 2.8 |
| Oral Communication | 4.2 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| Phys. Ed. | 7.0 | 5.1 | 3.3 | 0.9 |
| Social Studies | 9.3 | 20.9 | 8.8 | 13.0 |
| Science | 13.0 | 7.9 | 15.4 | 3.7 |
| Grammar | 0.9 | 7.9 | 0.9 | 3.7 |
| All of Language Arts | 4.7 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 5.6 |
| No Answer | 5.1(11) | 5.6(12) | 4.7(10) | 4.7(10) |

* * * * * * * * * * * *

## CONCLUSION

The paragraphs above have attempted to convey to the reader, the perceptions of lecturers, principals, supervising teachers and beginning teachers concerning the preparation of teachers to teach reading and associated language skills.

It was stated at the beginning of this report that there are no simple solutions to the perceived problems raised. It is hoped, however, that the survey will stimulate discussion amongst those involved and/or interested in Reading Education and from this discussion, proposals for further research in this area will be generated.

Below is a list of topics in which further research might be undertaken (and indeed are being undertaken by some institutions):

1. A comparison of the objectives of school personnel and college lecturers concerning the preparation of teachers to teach reading and associated language skills.

2. The relationship between the amount of time devoted to reading education and the effectiveness of outcomes.

3. An evaluation of school-based approaches to reading education.

4. An investigation of communication systems to improve the liaison between college and school personnel in reading education.

5. Evaluation of teacher education approaches in reading teaching at practising school.

6. An investigation of courses for teachers on the role of the supervising teacher in reading education.

7. The role of reading education in the training of secondary school teachers.

As one contribution to discussion on the preparation of teachers to teach reading and associated language skills, the Board of Teacher Education organised a one-day conference in May 1979. The proceedings of this conference are now described in Section 2 of this publication.

## SECTION II

## CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

### THE TEACHING OF READING: A JOINT RESPONSIBILITY

(held at the Bardon Professional Development Centre, Brisbane, 26 May 1979)

## PREFACE

As a follow-up to the teaching of reading survey, the Board held a one-day conference at the Bardon Professional Development Centre on Saturday, 26 May 1979. The purpose of the conference was to enable various invited groups (representatives of colleges; schools; employing authorities; professional, student and community associations) to share their problems and ideas on the subject. The conference was officially opened by Mr A.E. Guymer, retiring Chairman of the Board of Teacher Education, and closed by Professor B.H. Watts, the incoming Chairman. The conference Chairman was Dr J. Elkins, President, Australian Reading Association (1978-79).

1. In the morning sessions, Mr W.L. Hamilton, Chairman of the Teacher Education Review Committee outlined the history of the 'reading' project and the reasons why the Board had embarked upon it. This was followed by School and College Panels who commented on the results of the Board's survey and also outlined the present situation in Reading Education, as they perceived it. The views of Principals, Supervising Teachers, Beginning Teachers and College Lecturers were put forward and discussed. All panelists had previously taken part in the survey.

   . In the School Panel, School Administrators were represented by -

   Mr L. Barton, Principal, State School, Grovely. Q.

   Mr J. Christiansen, Principal, State School, The Gap. Q.

   Mr Christiansen acted as spokesman for the School Administrators.

   . Supervising Teachers were represented by -

   Mr N. Dempster (1), Teacher, State School, Enoggera. Q.

   Mrs G. Murphy, Teacher, State School, Aspley. Q.

   Mr G. Scott, Teacher, State School, Rangeville. Q.

   Mrs Murphy acted as spokesman for the Supervising Teachers.

   . Beginning Teachers were represented by -

   Mr B. Hill, Teacher, Infants School, Mabel Park. Q.

   Ms A. Kerins, Teacher, Our Lady of the Rosary Catholic School, Kenmore. Q.

   Mrs J. Fuller, Teacher, State School, Wooloowin. Q.

   Mr Hill acted as spokesman for the Beginning Teachers.

   . In the College Panel, Reading and Language Lecturers were represented by -

   Mr K. Albion, Senior Lecturer, Head of Division of Curriculum Studies, North Brisbane College of Advanced Education.

   Mr G. Bull, Lecturer, Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education.

   Mr A. Morris, Senior Lecturer, Co-ordinator, Centre for Studies in Reading, Kelvin Grove College of Advanced Education.

   Mr P. Patullo, Senior Lecturer, Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education.

2. In the afternoon sessions, guest speaker, Professor S. Ball, Professor of Education, University of Sydney, identified the major issues emanating from the School and College Panels. A group discussion followed in which heterogeneous groups formulated over 30 recommendations for improving the preparation of teachers for the teaching of reading. These recommendations were discussed in the closing session.

(1) Mr Dempster is now attached to the Brisbane South Regional Office as a Regional Advisor in Social Science.

Below are presented the edited transcripts of the proceedings of the conference.

## INTRODUCTION

MR W.L. HAMILTON

The Teaching of Reading: A Joint Responsibility. I believe this conference to be a unique gathering, called together for a very important purpose. The research which is the basis for our discussion, I believe, is highly significant, both presently and potentially.

Presently, because it has already brought about needed changes, and potentially, because we have now a bench mark against which to measure the results of those changes. Some knockers might say that these changes would have occurred irrespective of this research and, of course, to some extent that could be true. My own opinion though, formed from the advantage of an overview position, is that changes to college and university courses that might have taken place, might very well have not been adequate. Indeed, of the changes that have already taken place, or have been planned for and which are under examination by the Course Assessment Committee of the Board of Teacher Education, some, in my opinion, are not yet adequate to meet the need. I believe that's the result of competition within colleges for scarce time and resources which is a fact that is probably well known to many of you.

Although our research is the direct result of the concern of the Board of Teacher Education about the standards debate, it's not based on an assumption that the teaching of reading in Queensland schools is bad, but the belief that it could be better. In the well-known A.C.E.R. survey of basic skills, Queensland children performed relatively well compared with their Australian, American and British counterparts. Nevertheless, the results could improve. When we find that in an outer Brisbane suburb there were over 100 people between the ages of 15 and 50, who responded to our advertisement for literacy classes, we know that we cannot relax in our efforts to provide better teachers and better teaching.

At this point I'd like to acknowledge, with very sincere thanks, the participation of college personnel and teachers, both experienced and inexperienced, in this project. I know that this co-operation, which has made the research possible, will continue because, after all, we have the same aims, if not the same perspectives.

We don't look upon the information that we obtained from this project as definitive results or findings. That's not our purpose. We simply set out to report the perceptions of the various people involved in this important part of teacher education. The report has important implications, I believe, for everybody concerned with trying to teach children to read. It has implications for colleges and, of course, these implications have already been recognised by the colleges, and I hasten to add that some of the colleges had already recognised these issues before this project took place. The results also have implications for practising schools, for the teachers in practising schools. The results have implications for schools in general, especially in relation to the induction of beginning teachers, and the results have implications for employers with regard to the obvious need for in-service education of teachers in this important area. In fact, our next research project, which has already begun, is looking at what sorts of induction procedures for beginning teachers are followed throughout Queensland by the profession.

We must avoid the very human tendency that we've observed when the results of the reading research have been talked about, and that is to blame others. As soon as we feel threatened in what we're doing we look around for somebody else to blame. Now, of course, it's not the intention of the Board of Teacher Education to take that approach at all. We simply want to lay before you the perceptions of people which you may or may not believe to be fact, and then give you the opportunity to discuss them. We feel that what we're doing today, and what we hope to continue to do is to

challenge those involved in this important work to do something about the important perceptions revealed in the report.

This is your day and I know that you have all come here in the spirit that this topic is important enough to talk about, that it is a shared responsibility and that we have only one aim: to meet our responsibility better than we have in the past.

## SCHOOL PANEL

MR J. CHRIS'IA 'SEN

It is indeed pleasing to be present at this conference and to be invited to take an active part in it. The Board of Teacher Education is to be congratulated on its initiative in developing this research project and in making this conference possible. The foundation members of the Board would be delighted that the Board is now fulfilling all the obligations which were handed to it some eight years ago and that it is giving such leadership to teacher education in Queensland.

The survey conducted by the Board showed that all sections sharing the responsibility for teacher education in reading were aware that improvements were necessary in the preparation of young teachers for the classroom. The colleges were certainly aware of the complexity and breadth of the courses needed for the purpose and expressed the opinion that they could be achieved only to a certain degree. There was a need for on-going in-service education for all teachers, including secondary teachers. The claim that all teachers, secondary, primary and pre-school, should be trained as teachers of reading is difficult to refute, so fundamental is the skill to the learning processes in every subject.

All that is good, and promises a brighter future. Colleges are allotting more time to their reading courses but again the survey shows that the beginning teacher and the administration in schools still show discontent with the ability of college graduates to teach reading. The schools and the beginning teachers expect that they should be at least functional on their first day at school, that they should have a concept of the breadth and content of a reading program and that they should be able to develop and implement reading programs. The lack of time spent in learning how to teach reading up to the present, has meant that what has been learned is selective, piecemeal and lacking in continuity. This of course is not the fault of the colleges alone. There are complaints from beginning teachers that schools do not have or do not show statements on reading policy, have no induction or in-service courses for the students and no guidance in program development at the classroom level. It is obvious that there is no programming of college and practice-teaching situations which will ensure that pre-service teacher training will provide with an adequate background of what will be expected of them in the early days of their professional practice. Colleges tend to disclaim the responsibility for what kind of training is desired, by saying it is up to the practising school. On the other hand, the schools expect that the colleges have the responsibility of ensuring that all aspects of the teaching of reading are covered in the pre-service years.

Of course, the fundamental problem is the almost complete lack of co-operation and liaison between college and school. It is claimed by the schools that there is too much theory by the colleges, that they have no control over practical teaching situations. In effect, both situations are mutually solvable. Above all else, the school must have a completely designed reading program containing all aspects of the teaching of reading - the developmental attitudes, the development of skills and the application of skills. It must ensure that not only the word knowledge skills but also the comprehension skills (both factual and inferential), the oral and silent reading skills, library skills, critical thinking skills are being developed. The development of those skills, of course, is not the end product of reading in the primary school. Too often in the middle and upper primary schools stalemate and regression occur through an overdose of 'reading lessons' long achieved by a bored clientele. Too often it is

forgotten that the ultimate aim of the reading program in primary school is not the acquisition of skills, not competence in those skills, but an independence in reading which will allow the child to apply his skills in functional creative and appreciative situations. Only then will there be a complete reading program in the school.

The supervising lecturers, of course, should have a broad knowledge and understanding of the overall reading program at the school where his students are to be supervised. It seems essential that he should have a close understanding of it so that through it he should be able to relate his lectures to practical situations. There should be no grounds for the charge of irrelevance and too much theory. It is unfortunate that too many supervising lecturers have no background or very little background in the teaching of reading, that lecturers in specialist areas are supervising practice-teaching in reading and that secondary-trained teachers are assessing students in areas such as reading where considerable expertise over a wide area is required.

I have taken considerable time in this area of liaison between college and practising school, for here lies the basic problem in teacher education - 'never the twain shall meet'. But it requires only schools and colleges to ensure that there is given to graduating teachers a complete understanding of:-

- what is meant by a reading program;
- the ability to implement a reading program;
- the aims of the reading section of the curriculum guide;
- the importance of attitudes to the development of reading;
- the necessity for high skill development in reading;
- the application of reading skills in functional, creative and appreciative situations;
- the need for an interest and love of books and reading; and
- the inter-relationship between language and reading.

MRS G. MURPHY

First of all, I'd like to say how delighted my practising school colleagues and I are, to be consulted at all in this matter. For me personally, with over 14 years in large practising schools, and likewise for the other people on the panel, it was the first time that our opinions have ever been sought on such pertinent questions relating to the teaching of reading. We hope it won't be the last time.

It was also the first time in many years that we've been required to assess our own thoughts about the relevance of the teaching structure. Our panel felt that it was our job to try to blend the comments on the Board's survey with a brief outline of the present overall situation as we see it.

As you are aware, we, as primary teachers, were asked what skills we aimed at producing in our students; what amount of preparation we required; what types of reading lessons we set; and what help we provided for the student teacher. You have a resumé of these details.

I think it would be fair to say that in the pre-school and lower primary areas, the setting of reading lessons incorporating the word attack skills, phonics, word games, vocabulary, questionning skills and so on, attitudes to comprehension, using a variety of approaches in the lessons, and also the demanding of comprehensive notes, seems fairly well catered for. Perhaps this is because in that particular area of the school, the lessons are more concise, and the results in pre-school and Years One to Three are more obvious to the participating teachers and students.

In the middle and upper schools, however, a rather different picture emerges. On the one hand, the teacher has to spend considerable time making students familiar with the particular scheme operating before they begin the teaching practice, because we all

know to the non-initiated how formidable some of these schemes first appear to be. On the other hand, while the practising school teacher would not be deliberately omitting it, the teaching of reading is but one of the increasing number of topics to be covered as children progress through the school. Therefore, it often tends to get lost as a specific process.

The 'lostness' is very delicately expressed in the survey, which suggests that the teaching of reading has not been emphasised as a priority through the entire primary school. We would agree with the Board's finding. In an examination of the organisation of training and reading at the practising school level, we will help to indicate why.

We would go so far as to illustrate a haphazardness in this area of organisation in the practising school. It is haphazard because firstly a student coming from the college with which my school is associated, has to usually develop a unit from the range of the curriculum studies and reading lessons may, or may not, be a part of this. It is haphazard also in the lack of time available at practising school, which means that the system does not facilitate the idea of the continuing nature of the reading program. It is haphazard because we mostly all realise that we pay scant attention to diagnostic and evaluative procedures with the student teachers. It is haphazard because in our experience of the organisation of practising schools there is very little, if any, discussion or feedback either among staff practising teachers or between the staff teachers and student teachers. Consequently, we are not sure whether students are confused because they lack confidence in their related skills and the steps of teaching reading; whether they are frightened because they must follow a pattern once seen in an observation lesson and perhaps they feel they should follow that pattern always because they're going to be assessed on this; or whether they are simply turned off by the unfamiliarity of the reading scheme.

What the panel feels, as confirmed by the survey, is that rarely will a student teacher when given a choice, elect to take a reading lesson, particularly in the middle and upper schools. This must surely be due in part to inadequate organisation on the part of the practising schools but, it also demands a look at the role of the colleges in the organisation and training of the teaching of reading. Many of the problems which arise may be put down to inexperience on the part of the student teachers, but my colleagues generally support the view that the students would benefit from a much more intensive study of curriculum content and methodology. There is a general feeling that the theoretical knowledge attained at college is too removed from the practical classroom environment.

This in turn leads us to the old-age problem of communication. Personal liaison, or written communications between the college and the practising school have been conspicuous by their absence; that is, communications relating specifically to the teaching of reading. Written communiques are usually the last resort in getting one's message across, whereas we regard personal liaison as potentially significant on two counts. Firstly, the college lecturer could take a more positive supervisory role in the on-going development and co-ordination of the teaching process. And secondly, it would enlighten the practising school teacher.

In-service courses on the role of the supervising teacher have simply not been available. In the present situation many of us feel that in our own teaching, we reach a plane whereby the majority of the children in the class read adequately. Remedial help is available from resource teachers for the real 'at risk' children, but what about that small cell of under-achievers in the class? What about the fluent reader who could perhaps be introduced to speedier reading, better comprehension etc., by the modern methods that are being developed?

We often need help too. There is a fantastic potential for liaison between the two bodies - the practising school and the colleges. Perhaps we, as practising teachers, subconsciously avoid the issues pertaining to reading with our students and among ourselves, because we do not have the confidence nor the training to justify the how, the what and the why of our own practices in the teaching of reading.

In conclusion, we'd like to comment that the survey certainly raises some pessimistic notes. It suggests that the student knows what he does not know, that the practising

teacher is not sure that he knows enough about what he is supposed to know, and that the colleges are just the meat in the sandwich.

I hope I've adequately identified the main elements of the survey and conveyed the current feelings of my colleagues in the practising schools. We optimistically look to this conference today to provide avenues whereby the consumption of this sandwich may be regarded as a really inviting and wholly satisfying experience in the future.

MR B. HILL

Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I'd like to speak to you on behalf of our panelists who, being representatives of different colleges, therefore feel able to speak on behalf of the beginning teachers in Queensland.

The research project involved both a questionnaire and an interview on a sample of beginning teachers from various colleges. The survey looked at teacher preparation in three basic areas on which we would like to speak.

(i) Preparation at college;

(ii) Preparation at practising schools;

(iii) Preparation in 'first year out'.

(i) Preparation at college

More than half the teachers stated that they had received poor or very poor preparation in reading at college and 81.8 percent of teachers expressed that there was too little course work in curriculum content. Reading was chosen by the majority of respondents as a subject which teachers would like to know more about. This we believe was due to the fact that a large proportion of students didn't undertake a compulsory reading course. The language arts courses which were undertaken gave minimal emphasis on the teaching of reading, and more emphasis was placed on the innovative and creative areas, for example, drama and creative writing, rather than on the development of a reading program. To most, reading seemed a vague entity, a part of Language Arts, but of a secondary nature with little need for explanation or emphasis. It was only to be touched in passing. At college, impressions were that reading was a natural phenomenon - everybody has the ability to read. It's like breathing, it takes care of itself.

In Phase I of the survey, lecturers stated that the Language Arts Curriculum Guide was not only on the prescribed reading list, but also was extensively analysed and evaluated. However, from the interviewing groups which the panel attended, this was greatly contradicted. Students experienced from nil to minimal contact with the Curriculum Guide. Those fortunate students who came in contact with the Guide never clearly understood where reading fitted into the overall concept of Language Arts. This feeling of uncertainty was general in the overall perception of school curriculum, for the majority of students related the same horrifying experience when first reaching the school: the presentation of eight volumes of syllabi with the instruction to plan, organise and teach.

Because reading forms a large part of the classroom timetable, there seems to be a great imbalance in the proportion of reading looked at in these language arts programs, particularly the courses that have been undertaken at college. No reading course seems to give information on the planning and implementation of the reading program. Therefore, the majority of students felt very inadequately prepared by their college.

(ii) Preparation at practising schools

In the practising school situation, beginning teachers mainly supervised reading lessons rather than gaining experience in the actual organisation and the teaching of those

lessons. It is interesting to note that reading lessons were low on the list that student teachers chose to give in relation to the visiting lecturer. This would indicate that students felt very inadequately prepared in the teaching of reading. Also, through personal experience, more credit was given to students when they demonstrated more imaginative lessons from other areas of the curriculum.

Because the students were mainly given a supervisory task in reading, reading lessons to them were mundane and therefore unsuitable for assessment by the visiting lecturers.

Reading ability groups were already established in a classroom, thus the student received no experience in diagnosing, organising and planning a reading program involving groups. Very few were involved in actual classroom planning of the C.C.P. and teachers weren't even seen to use the Language Arts Curriculum Guide. Teachers did not openly discuss with students, especially in the middle and upper classes, the apparent reading methods available and their implementation in their particular class. However, students received more help from the lower grades on how to teach reading.

(iii) Preparation in 'first year out'

The majority of beginning teachers, when interviewed, expressed that they were confused when confronted with a class because of their lack of knowledge in the teaching of reading. Consequently, beginning teachers experienced difficulty in constructing a reading program that would cater for the needs of their own class. Many reported that they had resorted to a trial and error method, while others stated that they had been given greatest assistance by fellow colleagues in the school.

In preparing this address, the teachers on the panel submitted personal notes on their experiences in relation to the teaching of reading when first entering the school. I'd like to quote from one of these notes. I think it adequately describes the distraught feelings that many beginning teachers experience when they are faced with the teaching of reading.

"I wasn't and I'm still not completely familiar with the school reading scheme. Again, school assumed that college would have covered it. One teacher gave me a bit of a hand but time was short, as it is in the schools, and she assumed that I knew a lot more to start with than what I did. Planning my reading, real or satisfactory, is not yet existent. It's very much a 'hotch potch' affair. I stumble along not knowing how I should approach things, nor what I should be doing and hoping that what I do will be adequate but fearing that it isn't. When teaching reading I feel totally inadequate. Sometimes I score a bull's eye and things are okay, other times it's like walking a tight rope."

Based upon this discussion, we've arrived at certain recommendations that we believe will be effective in assisting to ease the problems which we are facing.

(1) The first recommendation is for compulsory practical college courses in reading and curriculum programming. We have noticed in the survey summary that many colleges have implemented such a course and we support this wholeheartedly and hope that it may continue.

(2) Greater liaison between practising schools and colleges thus establishing a continual program between both places. This recommendation has been mentioned by supervising teachers in the summary.

(3) An induction program in every school which would provide an overview of its reading scheme for beginning teachers and time to discuss the nature and also the planning of the school reading scheme in terms of implementing it in the classroom.

(4) A minimum number of first and second year teachers in an advisory capacity on the Board of Studies in the colleges of advanced education. We see this as being essential to ensure that colleges don't become a closed system, thus enabling

them to have a greater awareness of the problems facing their beginning teachers.

(5) For colleges to adopt an internship style of teaching with student teachers in the practising schools, in which students would spend a whole semester in the school during their mid-college course. This would enable the students to be personally involved in curriculum planning and organisation, on a whole school level, gaining vital information and experience in school life generally.

Thus it would substantially aid in lessening the gulf which exists between theory and practice in methodology and curriculum study courses in the remainder of their college program. The students would be seen to provide a greater and more personal feedback into the discussion groups of such courses.

These recommendations are not meant to sound radical but practical in the solving of the problems which we face.

QUESTION AND DISCUSSION PERIOD FOLLOWING SCHOOL PANEL SEGMENT

Q.1 **Mr Christiansen, could you elaborate on your thoughts concerning reading schemes?**

Mr Christiansen's reply:

I believe that too many schools are buying reading schemes that are sometimes of doubtful cultural background and sometimes of incomplete coverage of all the requirements of a reading program. My argument is that they are using reading schemes as reading programs and very often they are deficient. I'm not saying that reading schemes should not be used, but I am saying that they should be relegated to their proper position as resources that are suitable for various parts of the reading program.

Q.2 **Mrs Murphy, how would you see in-service courses for supervising teachers best organised?**

Mrs Murphy's reply:

I think that withdrawing teachers direct to colleges for small periods of time is a very good idea. I'd like to see a really practical course where the teachers are taken into the college or, alternatively, into such things as a teachers centre or wherever there is a suitable place. These courses should be on-going. They should be based on the assumption that we don't know much about the teaching of reading. I would love the opportunity to go along to in-service courses. I think it would help me in the ordinary classroom situation. So I think that with all the expertise available, I'm sure we can come up with some plan of either withdrawal or people coming to the school to give demonstration lessons. I think that there's a wide variety of approaches available. But I think that you have to accept that the people who are going to do in-service courses on their own volition are very few, and that's wrong, I know, in principle. It's not very professional probably, but I think it's pretty true, and I'm just saying that you have to provide the opportunity and literally almost push us into it.

Q.3 **Teaching is one of the few professions, or the only profession I think, where we are considered full professionals at the end of our period of training. Shouldn't there be some sort of introduction into the school where you're not thrown straight into a classroom, but given time to find out how, for example, the school policy and the reading program is developed? How would beginning teachers feel about that?**

Mrs Fuller's reply:

I think a term in a school would be an adequate time whereby you were assigned to a classroom teacher, like a supernumerary, and you'd learn all you can from that teacher. It's only when you're out there that you realise that you've got to know this, and you can then call upon your college experience. As it is, you've got your class straight away.

Mr Hill's reply:

From our studying the survey and talking also to other beginning teachers we feel that it's necessary that we have a large proportion of time at college given to practising school experience. I think if we have the time in the schools after we finish the college course, it's too late. It's not really till the students get to the latter part of third year that they realise, 'I'm going to be faced with 35 children, what am I going to do?'. It's not until you reach the maturity as a professional person that you can realise that some of the things that you've been learning can't really apply to the classroom. I think that maybe after 24 months of college, students should go into the school for a semester and learn how to plan and how to organise, learn about the curriculums, in particular, the language arts program. Then students could come back for the remaining 18 months of their college course, doing foundation courses. Everything then would be related back to the classroom experience which they'd had, and the students would be mature enough to know what they can apply to the class in the teaching situation, and what doesn't work. I think it'd open up far greater discussions on a personal and professional level back in the colleges. They'd realise what is happening in the schools and how it would relate to them. I think it's a very bold move and one that we think is essential to bring students to a professional level before they actually get out into the school situation.

Q.4 **One of the things that has come through in the survey, and it's been reiterated here by speakers, is that students very often don't select lessons in the teaching of reading and they don't get much opportunity in their three years in the practising schools to try all things. Something that has been talked about for quite a while is the gradual development of a check list by students as they progress through their college career, indicating those sorts of things that they should be experiencing and putting some sort of mark in when they've been exposed to that experience. Is this possible at all?**

Mr Barton's reply:

One of the points that Jack Christiansen made when he was speaking was that there needs to be a liaison between the colleges and the schools. I think this would be one of the points of liaison that could be set up between the two bodies. There has to be some understanding about what the colleges want the schools to teach in the practising school situation, and there has to be understanding by the schools of what the colleges teach. Until we get that complete understanding, I don't think that the scheme that you have suggested will work thoroughly. There has to be complete liaison between the two groups.

Q.5 **I was very interested in the comment that there should be more time spent in the practice schools during the college years and I suppose that would apply to end-on courses as well. In all of these things, however, there's got to be some give to the extra take, as it were. If you do insert a six-month period for extra teaching practice, you're going to have to take something out of the college course. If you do insert more work on the teaching of reading in the college course, you're going to have to give up something for it. I was wondering if one of the beginning teachers would like to comment on what they see as the kinds of things that could be given up.**

Mr Hill's reply:

If there was liaison with the college, extra teaching practice would not mean a break from college, but it would be the college coming into the school. With the

courses within the school, the students would still report back to the lecturers concerned, because they would still be doing the course of the college. It's just that the grounds to do the course is in the schools, working with the teachers. It's not deleting something. We see it as taking on another form.

## COLLEGE PANEL

**MR K. ALBION**

I would like to start first by saying that our college agrees, as I think most conference participants have agreed, that the survey results indicate very fairly what would be the perceptions of college staff, probably students as well as beginning teachers, and also teachers and principals in schools. I think that the final summary at the end of the report is very true, that most beginning teachers would perceive that they -

> had not been given any systematic introduction to the teaching of reading. They had mainly learnt a little about the scheme or program that was operating in the school from an experienced colleague, and by a 'trial and error' approach in the classroom. (Report Summary/Board of Teacher Education, May '79.)

I think it's a very sad fact that this is the perception of beginning teachers, and I don't think that we disagree with it. I think many of us have been aware of that for a long time. Many serious efforts have been made during these years to solve the problem. I think that it's one of the saddest things of all that the history of teacher education isn't one of glorious success. But, that's the way it is. I think our fellow panelists and all of you would agree that there will probably never be an inspirational moment in its history. Let's hope that there will be just steady, continuing development and improvement.

Problem Areas

(i) In college:

First, let's have a look at what our college perceives are the problem areas that lead to this sad conclusion to the report. I often wonder how people learn to read when we seem to have such a wealth of ignorance in the profession from the beginning teacher through to people who are involved in the teaching of reading. But in college we do have certain problem areas.

The first problem was isolated in the report by the question 'Where do you place reading within the college program?'. Do you say that reading is so important that we will ensure that in every year of the college course, students will do specific units in the study of reading? Do you do the same in the practising school? Do you isolate reading and say that every student will teach reading lessons in first year, mini lessons and major lessons, then sequences of lessons, leading up in third year to total planning and teaching of programs? Do you so organise your courses so that reading is isolated out? And we know that that's not necessarily desirable because equally, it should be said that there are many other elements of the college course that we should isolate out and teach with such dedication and determination. Although literacy is a major problem, a major area of concern, I don't know if that's necessary or desirable.

The second point is that if reading is going to be in your total course then do you treat it as a discrete subject or do you try to relate it both to the other areas of Language Arts as a total program, or do you in fact relate it even wider than that to areas like psychology, sociology and other major components of the college course? And how do you do this? I think that in every institution we're faced with the staffing problem of how to get a group of people across so

many different divisions, to work together as a team, and offer a co-ordinated systematic approach to the teaching of reading.

(ii) In schools:

Outside college we have what are the problem areas within schools. I call it the 'no guarantee nature' of the practice school experience, in that there is no guarantee that a student will even have a minimum experience with the teaching of reading, let alone a maximum experience. And what types of experience will a student have? The exclusive reading scheme approach. A reading scheme like Gage or Endeavour, to our horror, in some classrooms, may be the total and only experience of the teaching of reading. That wouldn't be a type of experience I think we would endorse, not because we're college lecturers, but because I don't think anyone concerned with the teaching of reading believes the scheme is really a method. It's only one resource, as Jack Christiansen has pointed out. There is a whole problem area there, and it's not that we want to control it; I don't think anyone wants to control it. We just want to ensure that the student encounters a range of experiences which will better fit him for teaching, and we imagine that there is a number of experiences that he should encounter. This problem was highlighted in the report by the comments on the fact that there is no ultimate control, over the type of practice teaching experience that any particular student receives. As I have said before, probably the ballot system for the national service and Vietnam was fairer than the way in which students encounter their experiences in practising school.

(iii) Between colleges and schools:

The third area of concern is that which occurs between colleges and schools. The real thing is not what I call liaison; I think that's a ridiculous and absurd notion that's developed. I think that what is lacking is a real professional working relationship. We don't work with the school staff and they don't work with us, and that's the way it is. We don't work hand in hand to plan the experiences for the students in their school. I think there is this tremendous dichotomy or division, whatever you like to call it, 'gulf' I think was the word used by our beginning teacher. And, of course, it leads to this idea that the college has a role and the school has a role and instead of getting together, we're just simply both partners in a student preparation of teachers. There are conflicts. I think we know what sorts of conflicts and what people say. We could see it today if you were listening between the lines. One person, for example, suggested a six months apprenticeship. But we are professionals. I don't like sounding snobbish, but I think that apprentices are not trained to act independently, individually, morally and ethically and make decisions about the lives and futures of human beings. I think that's a contradiction and inconsistency that must lead to an inevitable deterioration in the standards of education.

The result of this conflict is that the position of the student in the school is such that he has to follow a particular line of professional thinking and development while he's in the school during his practice teaching. When he's at college, he has to follow the college line. I think it's an unenviable position to place any human being where they are constantly having to remember who it is they're talking to, and who it is they're doing things for. If they're planning a reading lesson for a practising school teacher they do it exactly the way that teacher does it, and when they are handing in a reading lesson, perhaps for me, they say, 'Old Ken, we want to watch him, he wants this type of reading approach and only this type, otherwise its a zero'. We know that is a terrible position to expect, particularly in today's wonderful unemployment position, where a student's whole future depends on pleasing everybody, and not on becoming a good teacher.

Results

The major results of these problems are the sorts of things that came out in the previous session: first, the demand for more curriculum and less of something else; and

second, the demand for more reading and less education studies. I'd imagine there are two areas that people would prune, and some people already have: the area of foundation studies - psychology, sociology, philosophy, history of education; and also personal development type courses in art and music - who needs those? There is more student demand for more practice teaching, call it whatever you like, and less college work. More practice, and 'more' equals 'better' prepared, even to colleges; that is giving more hours to reading and therefore preparing students better for teaching reading.

I don't agree. I don't agree that more of anything ever equals better, because it means we're not going to re-think our whole approach to any area of concern, but we're simply just going to do more of the same, and we know we're going to get exactly the same result with more of the same, not an improvement at all. At our college I think we have undergone what's called a catharsis. We have psychologically, philosophically, morally and ethically had a real go at re-thinking the whole of the preparation of teachers and no longer just the preparation of little elements within the teaching program. No matter how significant reading is, it is in proportion to other issues in the preparation of teachers, one and only one element.

We agree that there is and should be solutions to the major problems confronting us, but we believe that the theme of this conference slightly modified for our college, is probably the best way to go. That theme is, 'the preparation of teachers: a joint responsibility', and not one which, as Mr Hamilton pointed out, has anything to do with allocating blame. It's just simply let's get together and let's work out a better approach. At North Brisbane we have done that. We have invented what we call 'School Studies', as a practical focus for professional studies.

School studies is a response to the often expressed need for a closer relationship between theory and practice. Not only does it satisfy that need by placing in a school context many aspects of the course previously based in the college, but it also encourages co-operative professional relationships by continuous contact of college staff and students with teachers and school administrators. Contact also with other educational resource personnel - (e.g., inspectors, advisory teachers) - to enable the students to be involved directly with the professional team which helps the school to function effectively as a learning environment for children.

We believe that you will follow the steps we have taken in this regard with a degree of interest. As we proceed along these paths, we become more confident that some of the solutions to problems facing teacher education may be found in that direction.

MR G. BULL

Mr Chairman, ladies and gentleman: I'll endeavour to be as brief as possible. I've planned my segment in more or less three bits. The first bit is just a very brief comment about courses at our college; then I'll comment about the survey as we see it at our college, both negatively and positively; and finally I'll look at the new developments, that is, what we've done since we've been surveyed.

As far as our courses are concerned, we have reading contained in what we call language and reading courses, the language arts being the listening, speaking and writing element, which is the language part of it, and then the reading - fairly obvious. So that we have those compulsory courses in each of the three years which gives us something like 132 hours, then we have a specialist course in the diagnosis and treatment area, which is also compulsory in third year. On top of that there are elective courses which students may take if they wish, which are focussed on children's literature and language as affected by things like sociology, philosophy and psychology. We then have a grand total for a student who may wish to specialise in the area - something like 270 hours. But the actual core component is more like 170 hours. We chose to plan our courses as language and reading courses rather than as reading courses plus other courses that were related to that, for the reason that we felt it was rather a useless exercise from our point of view to try to separate language, speaking and listening particularly, from reading. So that's the way in which our courses are planned, and that's really all I want to say about that.

On to the second part, which was the actual survey itself, and I want to talk about it negatively first of all because I would like to finish on a positive note. The first comment that I would like to make is that the survey is called 'Reading and Associated Language Skills in Queensland Schools' and one of the things that we noticed was that associated language skills were mentioned in the title of the survey but they didn't crop up much more after that, when I was asked questions as a college lecturer and when our recent graduates were asked questions, or so they said, about reading courses. And this may or may not be a good thing from our point of view looking at language and reading together. It was a weakness, because we felt to try to split the two out like that didn't allow for comment across the survey title, that is, associated language skills.

We also felt, as a group, that the Bassett report had things to say as far as we were concerned in teacher education, but it somehow seemed to be forced into the survey as some sort of a marriage, which didn't seem to make all that much sense to us from the amount of information that we've actually been given. Now this may or may not be the case, but from the information we got, there seems to be a forcing of one against the other which doesn't seem to make an awful lot of sense.

In terms of the sample in Phase II, the supervising teachers who were questioned on our program, as far as we know, were taken from Toowoomba schools and Toowoomba schools have contact with only our first and second level students. Our third level students practise mostly in the smaller country areas, the vast majority of them. For this reason we felt that some of the comments that were being made by supervising teachers may not have covered all of our language and reading courses. This doesn't mean of course that some of the teachers who were interviewed had not seen our third year students, but this tends to be the exception rather than the norm.

The size of sampling that was taken in the survey worried us also, that is, the sampling in all the three phases and particularly the initial ones where only just a very small number of students, that is, ex-graduates of ours, were actually asked to comment on our courses. And even with the latest survey, the 1979 one, we just wonder how many of our students were actually contacted - saying that one in four was contacted is certainly much better than previously.

It worries us also that of the panels that are here, we don't have a principal represented, nor do we have an ex-graduate of ours represented either. I realise that you have to limit the number of people in panels and that you can't have everybody represented, but we seem to have missed out a little there.

Also we want to make just a general comment about the conduct of the survey itself, that is the whole survey altogether. We tended to find out what was happening as far as the survey was concerned by meeting our students or graduates or supervising teachers socially, when suddenly somebody would come up to us and say, 'Hey listen, we've just been interviewed regarding this survey'. We would have liked to have been closely involved with those interviews, for example, to make concrete suggestions. We would have very much liked to have been in on the construction of the questionnaire, which was sent out to 25 percent of the sample, because I think I can speak for not only my own institution but also the institutions of the other speakers, that we are and would have been genuinely interested in co-operating with those people to find out from our own point of view the weaknesses that our students felt that we had. Anyway, let's call them my negative comments.

As far as the positive ones are concerned, I have to agree with Ken Albion in that we generally do agree with the findings in the summary that I imagine most of you have read. So it may very well be that even though we see certain deficiencies, these deficiencies have been made up by other areas that we're not aware of. In particular, we certainly do see that there are areas which don't have as much hour loading, if you like, as perhaps people would like - the curriculum areas in general, and compulsory course work hours in reading in particular, and elective areas in reading also. However, I do believe that there are many other people, like mathematicians, who are just as concerned about curriculum areas as we are, and who don't have enough hours in teacher education courses either. So that we've got a tremendous amount of pressure from all sorts of people, both within and without our institutions, to force in more

hours of all sorts of things. And I'm afraid you just can't do that, and it gets to the stage where you start to say, 'Well, what are we going to take out?'. I'm afraid that's the way it is, it's not a matter of saying, 'Well, let's do it a little bit differently altogether'. It's a matter of saying, 'What do we take out?'. So it may very well be that in order to compromise, we might want to focus more on quality of what we're doing rather than quantity. This is not to say that we believe our courses to be of poor quality, but we certainly do believe our courses are ones that can be improved. More time in practising schools in reading was another one which we generally agree with, although I'd like to make a comment about that a little later on.

The actual report itself I felt was most useful, as did my colleagues. One of the things that we thought may have been more useful, however, and this may in fact be forthcoming, is a breakdown of the tables rather than lumping all things together, starting to split them out, because we realise that courses at colleges are quite different. There's not a lot of information in there for us as a college because we can't see where we particularly have been at fault. And we can't see where our graduates see ourselves as being at fault. We would like to see much more particular information in those areas which is not provided by the report. In fact, we would like to see a report like this issued on each of the colleges, or certainly at any rate our own. Perhaps I shouldn't speak for the others. It may of course be up to us to actually get that information from our graduates ourselves, and perhaps we are at fault in waiting for the Board of Teacher Education to do it for us.

One comment that I would like to make on the whole survey itself is that it tends to me, from my reading, and this is only an intuitive feeling that I have, to be based on the idea that the student when he magically chrysalises into a graduate at the end of a year is seen by people to be an expert or supposedly an expert in reading; or he himself expects to be an expert in reading, or his colleagues in the schools to which he has been sent have expectations of his being an expert. I think this is an ideal situation which we will never, as colleges, be able to achieve. We have only one half of the job to do and I think that we certainly can improve, but as far as the other half is concerned, as is well and truly pointed out by those tables in the survey, there has to be a lot of information given to the beginning teacher, once that teacher gets to the school. I hope later on, particularly a couple of the principals I know here, will have some comments to make on those issues. I think that's basically all I want to say about the survey itself.

The last part is new developments in our courses. When I was talking about those courses in terms of actual core number of hours, they have only been persisting now for about three years. Our first graduates, which would have graduated in 1974, would not have been so fortunate, far from it. The new developments in our courses basically centre around what we call our Schools Advisory Committee, in which there is a representative, either a principal or his representative, from every practising school. We have in these last few months presented all our reading and language courses to that committee, and had those courses approved and endorsed. Generally, we have disagreements, as I think you always will in this area, but as a result of our deliberations we are now working on sending out information to all schools so that all teachers will know exactly what the students have done and when. We have been able for a number of months now to specify what sorts of lessons the teachers might teach in terms of reading lessons. The Schools Advisory Committee is insisting that we specify in much more detail the sorts of lessons we ask teachers to teach - in such specificity I might say, that we ourselves are beginning to get a little bit worried. Nevertheless, we seem to have quite an amount of control in terms of what the student teachers actually do when they get into the classrooms. This is far from perfect, and it's certainly not as good as what it sounds. We have an on-going committee which has been formed from the Schools Advisory Committee, made up of teachers in the field, who will look every year at our courses in reading, and make suggestions as to where these may be changed and improved. We have great hopes that this committee will lead us on to new developments in reading.

MR A. MORRIS

I should like to begin by congratulating the Board on its initiative in sponsoring the survey into the teaching of reading and to thank the people involved for organising today's conference. The efforts made by the Board are very much appreciated by the people with whom I come in contact and we hope that much good will flow from today's conference.

Many of the results in the survey could, no doubt, have been predicted but it is nevertheless important that they have been spelled out for we can now come to grips with them. I should like to confine my comments on the survey to two areas -

(i) The school's perception of college courses.

(ii) The link between school and college in teacher training.

(i) The school's perception of college courses

I think the point does really need to be made that it's a bit naive to think that colleges can prepare students to go out and be experts at teaching reading. It's also a bit naive to think that we can give students a practical course in an actual, real teaching 'knowing-what-it's-about' sense. We can't. One learns what it's about, the moment somebody else walks out the door, closes it and leaves you there with the class. We can't possibly duplicate that kind of thing given the present set-up of teaching practice, although I like the suggestions that have already been made.

What we try to do is to get students to work on a variety of approaches to teach reading. Our ambition is to produce a student who has some idea of what reading is about. One who can therefore work toward using experiences and a variety of materials to produce a relevant reading program for the particular pupils for whom he/she is responsible. This program we would see as developing reading ability in content areas and not only in the type of narrative material found in the majority of reading schemes.

Our courses do involve working with reading schemes and students do get to know several schemes in some depth. Some teachers who were surveyed suggested that students should learn how to use the commercial reading schemes whilst at college. There are two problems involved in this suggestion. Firstly, there are too many schemes. The Department of Education reading materials list has upwards of 24 different schemes. We frankly have neither the money nor the time to stock and teach every scheme. The good scheme does provide a systematic, developmental approach but it is misguided to think that reading stops at the scheme. We would much prefer more emphasis on language experience, wide reading, structured reading experiences in the content of subject areas and less reliance on schemes.

A good scheme does offer systematic structure and support to inexperienced teachers but must be broadened to meet local and individual conditions.

(ii) The link between school and college in teacher training

The second point I'd like to look at is the one with regard to the link between college and school, and I feel very much that this is at fault. I don't know what we can do tremendously about improving it because if you go out to a school, you all know what the situation is - the teacher's busy. Somehow, I think the Department has to come to the party and provide time for supervising teachers and colleges to get together. I think anything else other than that is tokenism, is beating about the bush. If the Department were to provide some time for supervising teachers and college people to get together, then we might start to get a better link.

Better links between school and college should to my mind provide a number of advantages.

1. The programs at college and school would be more closely related. Bearing in mind that the pupils in school have first consideration, it should be possible to provide experiences which complement each other. The school could in reality provide practice in the practical application of college theory.

2. Teachers would become involved as teacher trainers if they could be involved in the planning of practising school experiences. The responsibility should be a single one which is shared rather than two separate ones acting in isolation.

3. Schools would become more aware of developments in reading so that the experience of working with college staff and students provides on-going benefit to the school.

4. College staff would become more familiar with the day to day problems in specific schools and could provide more meaningful experiences for students.

As a first move towards an improvement in the college-practising school relationship, a series of three seminars is to be held in our Reading Centre before prac. school this year. The schools, in which Kelvin Grove students gain their practice teaching experience, are being invited to send the teachers who will supervise students to one of these seminars. These will be held on June 12, 13, 14 from 1.00 to 4.00 p.m. College staff will attempt to describe to teachers the courses students have followed and the type of experiences which the college sees as appropriate at this stage of the student's preparation. Teachers will be able to discuss these expectations and work with Reading Centre staff to clarify any issues which give cause for concern.

In future years, we should like to involve teachers at an earlier stage than this, in order that they can contribute to the better integration of college courses and practice school experiences. To this end the Reading Centre at Kelvin Grove will establish a supervising teachers' committee which from next year, will co-operate with college staff to jointly plan practising school experiences.

Meanwhile, there is information that we're sending this year to practising school. This information will delineate clearly what courses in reading the students have already done, the stage that they're at, and it will also give supervising teachers various things which they might look for. The practice teaching guide is our attempt to draw attention to what we think should be done, and the reading lecturers are available on request to go out and provide advice on the spot.

Incidentally, there are also other gaps that should be discussed, besides those between college and practising school. Somebody mentioned the gap between the lower school and the middle and upper primary schools. But there's another gap, you know. You would be amazed at the way kids come to secondary schools, not able to cope with text books. I'd suggest to you, the primary teachers amongst you, that one of the biggest gaps that you don't face, and I'll say this quite categorically, is how to use text books in a reading sense. Many kids on coming to secondary school flounder. They're given text books, they're not used to many text books and they really do have a problem. I would suggest to you that this is another gap that should be considered in school reading programs.

Be that as it may, the value of closer contacts between school and college are too many to enumerate. It is the hope of Kelvin Grove staff that these links can be developed in the future. The implications for teachers are undoubtedly more far reaching than they are for college staff. Time would have to be found for joint planning meetings. Teachers would need to plan for student teacher programs rather than simply receive them into their classrooms with a minimum of co-operation with college staff on the planning of practice school programs.

The Board's survey has highlighted some weaknesses in our programs. However, all is not bad and we should not be depressed. Rather, I feel we should seek to establish new dimensions to our planning for teacher training.

MR P. PATULLO

As the last College Panel speaker, I suppose I play something of the role of an epilogue and, therefore, if I do make points that have already been made, I do apologise, but might I also suggest that it may be quite significant that certain points are being made again and again.

Firstly, may I say that we're not here as members of one group to point accusingly at another group and say the problem is of your making. I think already in aspects of today's discussion, there have arisen some differences of opinion. That, I feel, is quite natural. But certainly one point which I feel we must accept as fact is this: there are in our society some children and indeed adults who are functionally not literate. Whether they be few or many, I don't think is really the point. The point is that we, as educators, have a responsibility, probably as much ethical as professional, to ensure that in fact all do achieve an adequate degree of literacy. And so I think the question really that we have to consider today is how may we co-operate to carry out what is our task, our professional task, our ethical task.

If I can refer for a moment to the report, and certainly I do over-simplify in this reference - but could one suggest that this report presents a quite profound and therefore rather disturbing list of what I can only term as 'should do's'? The supervising schools say the colleges should do this, this and this. The students say the colleges and the schools should do this, this, this and this. I shan't say here what private thoughts I've had, but I have had some. I think today that we are here, really, to define quite clearly those areas in which each group can make its most positive contribution, and I'd like to emphasise that phrase, the most positive contribution. In speaking on behalf of Mount Gravatt CAE, I want to talk about what the college can do, indeed what it has done; and because I want to deal in fact and not in myth, certainly I must also say what the college can't do.

I think a major constraint, and it is a point that has been made before, is that colleges have the commission to prepare teachers who are not to be exclusively teachers of reading. The primary teacher-to-be, as a generalist, does have to make quite significant contact with a wide range of curriculum areas. The secondary teacher-to-be may not, in fact, even conceive of himself as a teacher of English. If, for instance, Science is his bent, then he simply makes the assumption that his pupils will be able readers. Now these factors, I think you will accept, are very real constraints upon the degree of depth of offering that can be made. And perhaps anticipating the rejoinder of some of you, may I say that I'm not here today to argue that colleges are redundant. I simply say there are some things we can't do, but there are very many things we can do.

What the colleges can do very well is to induct students into an understanding of the reading process, and if I may perhaps put aside for a little while the olive branch that I do intend to carry for most of the day, could I suggest that perhaps schools and colleges are working from somewhat different notions of what reading is? Please don't misunderstand me, but is it possible that there is some lag between theory and practice, and if so, is it possible that the student finds himself confused by conflicting sets of theories and practices? I don't think this is the occasion really to enter into another great debate concerning reading, nevertheless, of course, that is a crucial question. Today, I simply want to suggest that some of those areas in which teachers perhaps judge students to be deficient, may indeed reflect a quite deliberate de-emphasis in respect to college courses in reading.

May I cite please, a brief example. Recently I asked a school principal, who's not here today, what he thought we should include in our reading courses. His reply was quite succinct: 'Teach them phonics'. We do, of course. But I think the implications of that sort of reply are interesting. Does a response like that imply that reading is quite simply a decoding process, wherein the child works from letter, to sound, to word, thus through each sentence, and so takes meaning from what he reads? I think to take the point a little further, if we adopt this view of reading, are we apt to cause the child to be more conscious of the individual word rather than the word in context? Quite frankly, I have watched some teachers assess children's reading performance, and that seems to be what they're concerned with. We can't, in all conscience, suggest to our students that this is the best approach to teaching reading.

Before leaving this particular issue I would like to make one final observation about it. I'd like to suggest that this possible conflict of models of reading is one that both teachers and academics need to explore. Perhaps it's one of the issues that might be considered this afternoon. Are we talking always about the same thing? And perhaps it's pertinent also to mention here, in connection with the Language Arts Curriculum Guide, that there is currently thought concerning the section on reading that there is a possible need to review aspects of it.

I think another problem is the point that Bert Morris has just made. A problem for the student and the beginning teacher is the sheer proliferation of reading materials. In the primary reading catalogue there are some 28 reading schemes listed. One must say of colleges and their courses, that they can and do play a positive role in giving students an awareness of the various reading series. For instance, at Mount Gravatt, we have established a reading centre, the purpose of which is to give students, in terms of formal courses and through consultancy sessions, some opportunity for coming to terms with some of the reading schemes available. But I think the following point has to be accepted. Certainly one can, in respect to these 28 plus reading schemes, present lectures that seek to focus on the various philosophies of the reading schemes. It's important that, if you're going to use the material, you must understand on what rationale it is structured. Certainly we can present workshops where the student can make close contact with the textual nature of the material. But I think the point to emphasise, is that we can provide only general contact with some of the reading materials that are currently in use. Perhaps it would be a fair question to teachers in the audience to ask how much they know of reading materials beyond their particular grade level. I think one should make the point that this was an issue raised within the survey - that such an expectation is being made, at least by some teachers, of students. Clearly, they cannot master in a short time such a comprehensive range of reading materials.

I said at the outset that I wanted to find that area in which each of the concerned groups could make that contribution for which it is most uniquely suited. I'd like to suggest that the colleges can, through their courses, ensure that students gain a comprehensive knowledge of the factors concerned with teaching reading. Two of these aspects I've already mentioned - an understanding of the reading process, and a knowledge of reading materials currently in use. Pre-service instruction must, however, incorporate other factors and principal among these, I would suggest, are testing techniques, both attainment and diagnostic types; modes of presenting a reading lesson; organisation and classroom procedures; and the development of skill activities that focus on such aspects as comprehension and word attack strategies. Of course, as I extend that list, as I add other items, I think one becomes aware again of the constraints that are imposed by time available.

There clearly is also another key limiting factor. Whilst I don't subscribe to the idea that colleges are essentially ivory towers existing in their own theoretically-based fantasy land, I think that in one sense, one has to suggest that all that is presented by colleges, is theoretical. This, by virtue of the fact that college courses do not, indeed cannot, afford direct contact with children. And that is a lack in our courses, but it is a lack that is rather impossible to solve. What colleges can do therefore, is present students with a very considerable, but general knowledge of aspects that are pertinent to the teaching of reading. What schools can do is to give students, under sympathetic supervisory guidance, the opportunity to focus closely on specific issues in reading and to focus at the level of the class, and more particularly at the level of the individual child and his performance. That's what schools can do very well. That's obviously what we in college courses can't do.

Having now admitted that colleges have not yet attained a stage of complete perfection, are there other sins to be confessed? I think one can say of the past, and perhaps even of the quite recent past, that more time should have been allocated to reading courses. However, reading has always been given at least equal treatment in relation to other curriculum areas, and this past compressing of time that was available to reading courses, let me suggest, was not due simply to rather ineffective program design. Rather it was a recognition of the fact that continuing teacher education beyond the pre-service phase tended to be rather an informal, sometimes wholly school-based process. Now of course, the climate has changed and structured in-service

programs are certainly very much part of every teacher's experience. This therefore does allow greater flexibility in pre-service courses and I think one can therefore cater rather more adequately in terms of time available for certain priority areas. But it is only of recent times that we've had just that little bit of extra leeway. And I would like to suggest that in terms of time available, it is really still just that little bit of extra leeway.

What I want to do now with the little time available is to draw attention to certain facets of those courses offered at Mount Gravatt.

We see reading as essentially a language-based activity and for this reason, you'll note that in both primary and secondary courses, a study of the nature of language has been made a pre-requisite to those courses that focus specifically on aspects of reading. For quite obvious reasons, a greater emphasis has been placed on reading at the primary level, but I think a highly significant focus to draw your attention to, for instance, might be the course in the secondary offering entitled 'Developing Basic Competencies'. This course aims to give not just teachers of English, but all secondary students, some insight into reading and the problems attendant. Again, the courses are structured with a view to integration with other aspects of language activity. We don't want to present reading as something quite independent of the totality of language functions. The courses offered in special education are significant in that these courses do place a very strong emphasis on clinical workshops. And may I say simply, it's regretted that such a situation can't extend to all reading courses, but I think you will appreciate the obstacles to this. Also, there are a number of in-service courses that the college offers, and of course we're aware of the need to extend this offering.

To sum up, might I suggest that Mount Gravatt CAE is conscious of the role it has to play in the teaching of reading, and speaking personally, I feel that the college has been generally effective in the initiatives it has taken. However, could I now return to an earlier point. By their nature, college courses must be somewhat global in their approach to reading. The finer focus on actual child reading performance is surely quite properly the province of the school, and ultimately that of the teacher within the classroom. He has an expertise and a precise knowledge of the individual child that cannot be replicated in any lecture room situation. We see the areas of our task, we see what the classroom supervising teacher can do, we'd very much like to co-operate and I hope that strategies for closer co-operation can in fact be the product of this afternoon's discussions.

## QUESTION AND DISCUSSION PERIOD FOLLOWING COLLEGE PANEL SEGMENT

Q.1 **Do you think that the students going into the courses at colleges fail to understand much of the relevancy of the theory that's associated with the reading process when they themselves learnt to read without that theory, and in many cases see little application of it in the classroom?**

Mr Albion's reply:

I'd agree completely that when most people come into college they have no idea about how they learnt to read. I think that in their experiences at college within the practising school situation, it is quite possible for the majority of students to go through and not actually see what you would call a range of reading situations. So they are not drawing on any experience, neither intuitive nor conscious. I agree completely with you, but that's what we believe is true of everything, not reading only. It is true of the teaching of Mathematics and this is true of a child acquiring Social Studies concepts and so on. Students come without that background knowledge of how they do it, they don't necessarily see or participate in means which make them aware of it, so how could they possibly make sense out of someone telling them how they should go about doing it? I'm sure that we are all trying to overcome that failure to get a satisfactory practical situation.

Mr Patullo's reply:

As my response to the question, the implications seem to be that, generally, students see little relevance in theory and do want considerable emphasis on practice. I think all of us can understand why that is so. We're comfortable in the classroom if we can go through a set of procedures and basically survive for the lesson that perhaps is going to be assessed. Because we ourselves can read and therefore perhaps have forgotten the initial problems we may have had in learning to read, perhaps sometimes students and others over-simplify the process and say, 'Please teach us simply a number of procedures'. One can see that as a very pragmatic and indeed somewhat professional approach because students do want to teach effectively. I think the other side of the issue, however, is this. It probably goes back to the point I mentioned before. There is an extraordinary amount of reading materials now, none of which claims to be exactly like the other one, and therefore there is considerable philosophy conflict in terms of the statements that are made. If because of this, we don't have theory, then are we guilty perhaps of failing to help the teacher find his way effectively through material that will in fact be used in the classroom? I think I'd like to emphasise the need for certain theoretical aspects.

Mr Bull's reply:

Everybody learns to read and there's a theory behind it. Every teacher of reading has a theory, even if the theory is 'I don't have a theory'. It's based on a lot of educational practices, thinking, and attitudes as to what reading really is. Teachers have a theory, teachers can't teach reading without a theory. What we've got to try to do is to make sense of what they are doing and try to make it obvious to them why they're making the choices that they are. My point here would be that this is what the theory of reading is all about.

Q.2 **Do you think that it is sufficient to offer an elective course on the teaching of English as a Second Language, especially in the light of the needs of second language children?**

Mr Patullo's reply:

Certainly some of us would prefer to see compulsory study of this area, but there are all those other constraints. How do you squeeze something extra in if something else pops out the other side? We can personally of course endorse it 'recommended to students' and perhaps try to have it more popularly received that way. I think the second point that I'd like to make is that an elective course such as that does at least certainly signify our awareness of the problem.

Q.3 **In view of the number of reading schemes available, don't you think that when a college allocates students to particular schools, it should make sure that those students are familiar with the reading scheme which the school is using?**

Mr Patullo's reply:

Yes, I think notionally that this is certainly something that we have sought to do. We have presently established at Mount Gravatt a reading centre, but we haven't the financial resources unfortunately to acquire all the materials we'd like to acquire. However, we have, as part of the formal instructional program, tried to home in on those reading schemes that are generally used, so that they can be offered to all students. We have also a related consultancy program wherein students who want to find out more about particular reading schemes can come and discuss it with us. But there is of course no element of compulsion in respect to that, and so I suppose to that extent, at the moment we can't relate to all of the students who might be going to a school using a particular reading scheme. Some of the initiative I think, they do have to exercise themselves.

Mr Morris' reply:

We find that people most interested in schemes are the in-service teachers who come back to college and there are x number of examples of a teacher who will say, 'I didn't know there was so much to this scheme; I've taught it for 20 years'. The teachers themselves who are out in the field are not aware of all the schemes. So I don't think teachers know all there is to know about the scheme, and yet you expect the students to know all there is to know.

Mr Albion's reply:

This discussion about reading schemes really does concern me. We are here at a conference called 'The Teaching of Reading' and it degenerates down into a discussion about how much students know about particular schemes. It's a tremendous terror to me, this fear that we have to have reading scheme No. 1. It is obnoxious that we need them. If we knew how to teach reading and we were aware of the vast resources of written material available in our society today, and we chose with some wisdom, we would have something that would involve children in learning to read which would lessen the destruction of the will to read in our middle and upper primary schools. This takes place because of reading schemes. I would say also that the majority of a student's training should be concerned with trying to ensure that they can help a child learn to read and knowing how the child learns to read. Forget all about whether you've got manuals, or haven't got manuals - they may be of some use, but I find most of them absolutely repellant; linguistically, culturally, and educationally.

## GUEST SPEAKER

### PROFESSOR S. BALL

Before returning to Australia in 1978, Professor Ball was Senior Research Psychologist with Educational Testing Services, Princeton, New Jersey (1968-1978), as well as Adjunct Professor, Psychology and Education, Columbia University, New York (1974-1978).

Among his research experiences, Professor Ball was the Director of Evaluative Research for the Children's Television Workshop production of Sesame Street (1968-1972) and Director of Summative Evaluation for The Electric Company, a television show designed to teach six to 10 year old children to read. Back in Australia, Professor Ball also co-directed the Van Leer Pre-School Project Design at Macquarie University, North Ryde (1975).

In 1978, Professor Ball was appointed Professor of Education, University of Sydney.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

I'm not sure whether my approach to the topic of reading is going to be theoretical or practical. I've lost count of the number of different ways theoretical and practical have been used so far this morning. I think often they're kind of pejorative words depending on what side you're on.

I'm not, as far as I'm concerned, an expert in the research literature in reading or psycholinguistics. I'm interested in educational psychology, but when Joanna Williams was the Editor of the Journal of Educational Psychology, and I was the Associate Editor, she did all the reading-related research reviewing. When I became Editor I asked somebody to do that kind of work for me, so I read the articles if they get to be published, but the ones that get rejected I usually don't see, which is a blessing.

So I suppose this really means that I'm not a theorist. Maybe I'm practical, because I did learn to read. When I was in kindergarten, and I can remember it very well, I was

the best boy in my class. We had on the top of the board an apple, and a ball, and a cat, a dog - I'd say a for apple, b for ball, c for cat, d for dog . . . I could go all the way through and I used to be the first one to finish and they'd let me out early because of that. I was the only kid in my class too, that had a picture of me up on the board there, you see, that was the b for Ball. I probably identified at a very early age with reading as a result of that, in a practical way, you understand.

Later on in life, while I was at the University of Sydney, I'd just finished an honours degree there and my mentor was Hugh Philp. Apparently a parent once called in to his office at the University of Sydney and said, 'Do you have someone who could teach my son to read; he's about 12 years of age and not reading very well?'. So Hugh said, 'Yes, I've got a student called Sam Ball; he'll teach him to read'. So for many months, every Saturday morning, I tried to teach this little boy to read, and I was unsuccessful; I was a failure. Years later I met the mother again, and she was a very kind woman. She patted me on the head and said, 'Don't worry about that Sam, because we found out later why you didn't teach him to read. It's because he's dyslexic, and that's why you can't teach him to read'. And I thought that was a marvellous discovery, that you can't read because you are dyslexic which means that you can't read; and I wish that I'd thought of that because I wouldn't have felt a failure all those years in between, you see; I'd have been able to salve my conscience very quickly that way.

I also taught teacher trainees to teach reading, but before that I had seven years of teaching in primary schools in New South Wales, so I did have a little practical experience teaching reading. I found that my ability to teach reading varied tremendously from year to year, depending mainly on the quality of the kids in my class. Some years they were bright kids, and I was a very good reading teacher. I really had to do very little and they read very well. Other years I found I was a terrible reading teacher. I couldn't get them interested in reading, and I often wondered about that. I'd like to argue a point here as a matter of fact, which will probably be my first point, and that is that educators tend to be narcicists. They look at the pool of children, or the educational pool, and they think that all they can see there is their own efforts, their own work, and if children are or aren't learning to read well it's because of them, the teachers, the educators and the educators of the educators. They ignore families; they ignore community generally, the cultural milieu; they ignore the mass media; and they're only too willing to blame themselves; they think they've got to try harder. Well, I think that's good to want to try harder if there are kids not wanting to learn to read, or not learning to read very well, but I think we've got to be a bit careful and not take all the blame ourselves.

In New York City, 60 years ago, a group of migrants arrived; they'd been arriving for some time actually. They were very, very poor and horribly impoverished; they'd certainly be below the poverty level that's regarded as low poverty level today. Most of them could not speak English, and yet many of them had children who not only learned to read English very well, but became professional people. I'm referring to the Jewish immigration into New York at the turn of the century. Years later, when the blacks came in there was not the same kind of result. You can see similar kinds of peculiar things happening with Spanish-background people. Cubans in parts of the United States have had very little problem with learning to read English, and yet with Puerto Ricans, it is a problem. I think what I'm trying to argue is the same as what a friend of mine put to me, someone who was himself bilingual, so he couldn't be accused, I suppose, of being too prejudiced. He said it's really not a bilingual problem so much as it's a social class problem. I think what he was trying to say was that it's the values that the child brings to school. The basic learnings in the home are far more critical with respect to how well the child will learn to read, than anything that the school does for the child, at least, as far as we know how to teach reading with our present technologies to date. In a way I think it's probably a kind of impudence for society to blame its schools for faults in things like the teaching of reading. There's a yiddish term called Chutzpa, and to give you some kind of a notion of what it means, there's the story of the young teenager who killed his mother and father, and then subsequently threw himself on the mercy of the court, claiming that he was only a poor orphan. That's Chutzpa.

You've got to look at our own society and you have to ask yourself, 'How much value do Australians generally put on areas like reading? To become a good Australian in our

current society, how well do you have to be able to read and what's in it for you to be a good reader?'. Well, if you're going to go to a barbecue you only have to be able to recognise one letter out of 26, and you have to be able to count. The letter is 'X' and you have to be able to count to four. If you're in New South Wales and you visit a club, you probably don't need any reading skills either; you need some pre-reading skills. You have to be able to match an ace, an ace, an ace. So you need some pre-reading skills but you don't have to get very deeply into reading to be successful in one of New South Wales' favourite occupations. I hope I'm not poking too much fun at us. I think too, that so many Australians enjoy a form of solar roulette, lying on the beach and seeing how long before they get a melanoma, and I think reading is probably counter-productive there; the book will probably shade part of your body and you might get a headache trying to read in direct sunlight. So, when you think of a lot of the activities that we indulge in, you realise that reading may not be such an important topic for lots and lots of people in our society. Yet we know better of course. We know that it should be, and we try our hardest to make sure that everybody becomes a good reader. All I'm trying to say is that as far as this kind of conference is concerned and all the good things that will follow up from it, we've got to hold things in some kind of perspective; we've got to realise that we have limitations as educators; that there is a context in which we work; and that all the marvellous moves that we could make, and we will make many of them I'm sure, are not going to make huge differences. They're not going to eliminate certain kinds of semi-literacy that we see in some of our upper divisions of schools.

Three television crews came out at lunch time today and interviewed me. I never get that kind of service in Sydney. It reminded me of an old saying that an expert is a fool who is a long way from home. And what did they want to know? Well, they wanted to know whether I thought illiteracy was on the rampage in Australian society. I said no, I thought it was probably just the opposite. We're better educated today and more literate today than we've ever been. At least I feel I am, I don't know about you. Every day in every way I get to be a better reader. They also wanted to know the influence of television because I did the evaluations of 'Sesame Street' and 'The Electric Company'. I told them that I thought that television was probably a beneficial influence for many reading skills, for the lower division of kids anyway. I hope that doesn't offend you who are reading teachers, because I know that there is this kind of general feeling that T.V. is bad. But if you look at standardised tests over the last generation or so, especially for first, second, third graders, it's remarkable how much increase in general knowledge and certain kinds of competencies that occur. Certainly television allows kids to come to school with a great deal of background knowledge, with their horizons widened, and I can't help but think that has to be a great help in areas like reading.

The television crews also asked, 'What percentage of our population today are illiterate?'. I said I didn't know, because I don't know whether someone's illiterate or not. If you choose one definition of illiteracy then about 80 percent of our population is illiterate. It goes down to about two or three percent illiterate if you choose another definition.

Tom Sticht of the National Institute of Education in Washington D.C. in the basic skills group, plotted the relationship between criteria of literacy and the proportion of population judged illiterate. The first criteria was writing your name; most people seemed to be able to do this. This was followed by 'reading familiar text aloud and indicating recognition of content'; that makes it harder of course. Next, 'reading unfamiliar text to gain new information', and then another, 'inferential reading of new text'. Well, you know, if someone's literate, they should be able to read some new text and understand what it's getting at, shouldn't they? Finally, the hardest one of all types used, and about 85 percent didn't seem to be able to do it very well: 'interpretive and relational reading of texts'. I guess that it's not at all surprising in one sense that you get such a widespread variability in terms of the percentage illiterate, if you keep changing your definition. But, as far as I know, that is one of the problems we have to contend with when people start talking about illiteracy in our society.

I've been talking about 'reading' up till now. Everybody, all this morning talked about 'reading', and I think one or two people did mention that we should be a little more

careful in defining our terms. I agree with that. So when we ask, 'Have we taught our teachers in training to teach reading?', what do we mean? Teach reading to six year olds? To 12 year olds? Both? In between? Isn't it possible that there are some teachers who are very good working with the children in their first years of school and getting some of those quick associations going between printed letters and sounds, while other teachers are very good with the older kids teaching them to make inferences as they read. We talk about reading as though it were a single process and we can just teach it. I think one of our problems may well be that we've got to think a little more carefully, a little more precisely, about what is reading, what are the skills we're trying to teach, and indeed whether it's possible to teach some of these skills.

As I see it, we get into real difficulty with reading comprehension. Perhaps one of the things that we're talking about when we're talking about children being able to read with comprehension is that they're good thinkers. They can take what's there and they can understand it and they can judge it, apply it, and see the inferences involved, and so on. How's that different from any other form of thinking that we go on with in any subject matter?

We had a little debate this morning about whether every teacher should be a reading teacher? In one sense of the term, it seems to me that every teacher not only should be a reading teacher, but every teacher can't help but be a reading teacher. How could the Science teacher not be helping children to understand better the printed page, or at least the printed page when it is dealing with an area like Science?

But, we certainly need a lot more basic research before we can say a great deal here. I had a fascinating conversation with a fellow at Utah, Dick Bunderson, who was doing some work on speed reading, and he was using electro-encephalograms (EEG's) with some people who did seem to be genuine speed readers. His point was that their brain rhythms were very, very different when they went into their speed reading process. Now, it could be that the way we teach children to read virtually prevents them from becoming that kind of speed reader. I think it's worth considering that anything we have to say here today is in terms of our best, current knowledge. We, ourselves, have to be very much aware that we can only proceed on that hazardous premise that whatever we do will be the best, in light of what we currently know, but there's a lot more to be learned.

There's no such thing as a free lunch, that's a fairly common expression these days, especially for those who are against policies of liberal government, because somebody has to pay for it in the long run. There's no such thing as a free reading program either. Departments of Education may sometimes think there is, simply because there may be no direct costs attached to it; but from an economic analysis there are certainly indirect costs. Perhaps too there are opportunity costs. That is, there's the cost that accrues by virtue of income or benefits that are foregone by using the teachers time by teaching reading rather than something else. If you decide that one of the things you ought to do in a reading program in a school is to free up one teacher so she can spend a lot of time with children who aren't reading very well, there's a great deal of cost to that school, and to the other children in the school who aren't getting that person's service. I think what I'm saying here is that we've got to be aware of the problem of costs and of opportunity costs in Australian education. The only people that I know of that have no opportunity costs in Australia are Professors of Education because they couldn't earn anything else, but most teachers certainly could be doing something else to the benefit of the children in the school. So I'm arguing that we've got to look at the question of costs in reading a lot more than we do. We usually come up with the idea that here's a good reading program, let's try it out. Nobody asks the question, 'How much is it costing? Could we spend that kind of time or money more beneficially perhaps in some other way?'. And so I think we should ask ourselves what it's going to cost to conduct pre-service courses for teachers differently and what are the benefits. When I say what are the benefits, I don't mean what are the benefits that we think there might be, but what are the benefits that we can see accruing when we try it out on some kind of experimental basis. We should go about this as systematically as possible. If we come up with some good ideas we shouldn't immediately say that's a good idea and go racing off to all the CAE's and beg them to favour us by implementing those good ideas, assuming that we had that kind of ability to communicate effectively. I think what makes a lot of sense is to try out a

number of ideas and see how much each costs and which ones seem to be having what kinds of effects. I think that in the long run, that kind of competition among ideas and the ability to sift through them to get rid of some that don't seem to work out very well, makes a lot more sense than anything else that I can think of when it comes to innovation in education.

Too often in evaluating innovating programs we use a model of evaluation known as 'the cardiac approach', which is to say we say something like, 'In my heart I know it's working'. I think I heard some of that this morning actually. I'm sure my institution's as guilty as any other so I'm not pointing fingers as though I'm some kind of blameless person or come from a blameless institution. As a matter of fact, I come from probably one of the oldest and most sterile institutions in the country when it comes to education. It's certainly noteworthy I think for its fierce and independent love of what used to be. Actually, I did suggest that we set up an Education Museum at the University and no-one saw the humour in it, nor did they agree with my proposal. They said it might cost too much.

Well, those, by the way, were the remarks that I'd prepared before I came here today.

What struck me as interesting this morning was that a lot of the things that were said touched on the kinds of things that I was going to say, so I decided to present my remarks just as you've heard them. Then I thought I would spend a little time conveying to you what I thought were some of the more important points that came across this morning from the various groups, with perhaps a few reactions of my own.

. . . Well, one thing that I thought was a really important and useful sign was that all groups seemed ready to come together to discuss issues. However, they came from prepared positions, in the sense that the people speaking each had a position from which they came. Again, that's not a bad thing, but I think it's very important for us all if we are to reach some constructive consensus on recommendations to be willing to decentre a bit. I think it's necessary, for example, for people with a teaching background to ask themselves whether they should feel quite so strongly about the question of practicality, and I think people who come from colleges preparing teachers, ought to ask themselves whether indeed everything that they put across in the name of theoretical background is indeed theoretical background that's worthy of that kind of name.

. . . A second thing that arose this morning, was the question of needs. A few of the speakers talked about beginning teachers coming into the schools not being able to teach this or that very well. Then some of the college people said, 'Yes, but how well would you expect them to be able to do it in their first year teaching; you know, be reasonable'. I think what we have to do is to be able to show that there is an educational need. It is not enough to be able to point to a situation and say, 'Wouldn't it be nice if . . .'. The question is what is a reasonable standard to expect, where is our current status with respect to that, and what is the discrepancy between that reasonable standard and current status? It's the discrepancy that's important.

There was to have been a Needs Assessment Study in Special Education in the U.S.A. They were going to survey American schools to find out what their needs were with respect to audio-visual equipment and they had a most magnificent questionnaire to teachers. Do you need a tape recorder? Do you need a T.V. set? Do you need overhead projectors? Now, they didn't bother to differentiate among the audiences. Teachers of the blind were being asked did they want overhead projectors. Now my guess is that most of the teachers would be only too willing to have those kinds of equipment in their rooms, I mean, why not? You might be able to use them some day. Or, if you're going to have a slide show at home one evening, you might be able to borrow the equipment. If the T.V. breaks down, you can borrow the school's for a little while. However, that kind of approach does not establish a need.

What I think we've got first of all to find out is what do a reasonable group of experts - people experienced in the field - think a well-run special education classroom in such and such a handicapped condition, should have. Then we should find out what actually exists in such classrooms. Then I think you could start talking about where the need is. So the question is, and I don't think I heard much evidence on this

question, what kind of a standard would you reasonably expect a beginning teacher to be at in terms of being able to implement a teaching program in schools of Queensland? Then, what are their skills when they hit the schools? I think that is information we have a right to know. Perhaps when we find out, we might find that there isn't nearly as bad a situation existing as we've been told. Or, perhaps we might find out that it's a lot worse than we think. I don't know. But then I don't think, unless you've had a lot of experience, and I mean a lot, in many different institutions and places, that you would know either, because all you'd know is your own relatively limited experience.

. . . Another point that I heard this morning which I think should be brought up again, is the notion that what's good advice for an experienced teacher may be pretty terrible advice for a beginning teacher. Beginning teachers have very different needs from experienced teachers, it would seem to me, and while I would advise experienced teachers to throw away any kind of prescriptive sets of materials and to try and mould their own from a variety of things that are available, I'm not sure I'd be as keen to give that sort of advice especially to beginning teachers lacking in confidence. I think that it is far better for them to have something that they can hang on to during the first year or so, even though there may be some limitations attached to it. I think they can break away from that as they gain experience and confidence.

. . . Another point that I think ought to be said again is that colleges can't, I don't think, develop close liaisons with every school that they're going to work with in practice teaching. Now, I haven't had a lot of experience in this kind of an area since I left Newcastle Teachers College in 1962, so I beg your indulgence. I'm confessing I have no recent experience in this kind of problem, but my guess is that colleges don't have the staff. I mean, how many lecturers in reading are there in comparison to all these teacher trainees going into the schools: I can't believe that you could have close liaison between the reading lecturer in the college and all the schools the trainees are going to.

I think, however, that simply saying something's difficult isn't enough. We've got to think of ways to meet what seems to be a real problem as it was expressed this morning. The only one I could think of quickly was asking the schools to take more initiative themselves, so that if a student knows they're going to School X starting on Monday week, they could go to the library at least and find out what School X does in the area of reading, perhaps look at some of the reading texts in the college curriculum lab. or the college library. I think there are various things like that which might be worked out so that students could be better prepared when they get to the schools. But you are the experts in this area and I presume these might be some of the things that might be coming out this afternoon.

. . . Teachers and students seem to stress the practical. But, according to my model of a good teacher, which may not be your model of a good teacher, the practical just isn't sufficient; it's just not enough. I think in your hearts you'll agree with me. I don't know whether you'll agree with me in other parts of your anatomy, but what I'm trying to say is something like this. An experience that I had one day a few months back may be one that you will vibrate warmly to. I went to a college of advanced education in a different state from this one, but I will not divulge its name to protect the innocent. I was on a panel that was looking into a proposal they had for a degree program in elementary primary education. They began in the morning to tell us what the rationale behind the program was and what kinds of teachers they were going to produce in this innovative program. They'd actually been trying it out for the last couple of years and they wanted a stamp of approval. They wanted to produce teachers who would be fit teachers for the 21st century, none of this 20th century nonsense, 21st century. And what kinds of teachers would they be: flexible teachers, that's what they'd be. Not just these teachers who were taught how to do something in a set way which may not be very useful in 10 years time when our theoreticians tell us that's the wrong way after all, but teachers who could think independently. As a matter of fact, they wanted thinking teachers more than they wanted virtually any other kind of teacher. And so it went on during the morning, this flexible, independent kind of teacher. We talked to the students over lunch. I remember asking one student what he liked best about his first year's experience in this program. He said, 'The practice teaching'. I asked, 'What did you like least about it?'. He said, 'The lectures, they were all so theoretical'. I

asked, 'Did you get nothing that was worthwhile in college?'. 'Yes, the chalk board practice, that was worthwhile because when we went out into the schools we could at least write on the board'. I'm not exaggerating the position very much, and as the day wore on it became very clear that, in terms of the courses being offered, in terms of the attitudes and values of the students, and actually of the people that were running some of these courses, it was no different from perhaps some of the teachers colleges of my day. I didn't see this as producing these kinds of independent-thinking teachers at all.

Well, we had a little discussion this morning about better language and what good does it do you. I mean you can learn about speech and it doesn't make you a good orator; you can learn about grammar but it doesn't make you a good writer. You can also learn to fix a car without understanding much about the physics of internal combustion engines. You can get these little manuals that says if the car won't start or if the car starts but goes phht, do this, this, this. That's not my idea of a good teacher, somebody who has such a manual. I'm sure it's not your idea either. I suppose we could develop a kind of a computerized mechanic teacher. We could have video tape receivers and if some kid does something wrong he can ask for advice. But that's not I think where we're going. I think it's reasonable however for teachers, young teachers especially, to think in terms of their own survival; without that they're not going to get very far, so that's their first interest.

I know at Sydney University just recently, we had a meeting of all the students after their first prac., and the look of relief as they walked in was amazing. They had survived that first practice. All the way through the only thing that had been on their minds, as far as I could work out, was 'What's it going to be like in the first practice?'. Well, it's a legitimate concern. I rather like the idea of teacher education courses that combine both pre-service and in-service elements. Now I know that there are all sorts of industrial kinds of matters to worry about, but if somebody came up with an idea that said, look, for the first three years we'll be fairly practical, we'll give them a lot of practical stuff - 78 ways to use the tape recorder, 74 things to do when a child shouts at you, and how to use behaviour modification with the rowdiest kid in the class. There are lots of good practical things that you can do, and plenty of observations and practical work. Okay, then let that person go out and teach for a few years, give him a diploma, and make it conditional upon his coming back to the colleges and doing some more work, dare I say of a more theoretical nature. By that, all I mean is that they reflect on what they're doing, listen to what other people are doing, try and work out what kinds of things work best for what kinds of kids and what kinds of teachers and so on. This is, after all, not very impractical; and also to do a little reading, because at least there might be some notion as to why you might be doing some reading at that point. After this, let's give them a degree, and let our primary teachers be as well trained then as our secondary teachers. That to me makes a great deal of sense. I'm arguing that I can't conceive of a good teacher not having both thorough practical skills as well as thorough theoretical understandings of what they're doing. There is the problem of how to train such a person in the limited time. So this way, we would have what sounds like a lengthy training period. As far as I'm concerned it ought to be lengthier than that in one sense, because I think a well educated teacher would recognise that they've got to keep going.

. . . Induction - the first year out. How's it going to be handled? Let's have some ideas on that and run a few, perhaps, quasi-experiments, demonstrations if you like. What about giving some of these first-year-out teachers a 66 percent or a 75 percent workload, not so that they can spend time on the beach, but other kinds of things they could be doing in the school. It's just an idea I thought of during lunch time. I'm not charging for it. I'm sure you could think of better ones. Pairs of beginning teachers working together - how's that for an idea? That could be quite an idea to help with induction.

. . . Another thing that came up this morning concerns evaluation planning. Evaluation planning, like any other kind of educational planning, has got to involve and begin with from the outset, the audiences for whom the evaluation or the plans are intended. If you don't get them in at the beginning you've got troubles. Now, there were some complaints on this topic this morning. I don't know the truth of them, all I've got is perceptions.

. . . The survey of reading and college instruction in the reading area has already been a success. I have this on the authority of a leading director of a CAE in Queensland, or should I say a director of a leading CAE in Queensland, I'm not sure which. I don't want to mention your name Bill because, you know, I've got to keep confidential my sources of information; but I understand from somebody in this room that CAE's have already begun to react to the fact that these kinds of surveys are being done and that there's attention being focussed on the area of reading. Now, all I can say is congratulations, that's excellent, it's a good thing. We're not trying to do some pure piece of research; we're not in the game of theoretical physics; what we're trying to do is improve education. Evaluation ought to be entirely to the end of getting better decisions made about education, and surveys like this, if they're reactive in that kind of positive way, are fine.

Finally, I think it's fair to say about this morning's effort, that a lot of it was predictable. Had many of you been asked what are the various groups going to say, you could have written down many of those things. Right? Does that mean that it was a waste of time? No. Because the process is very important. It's very important that people, not only are thinking about the same problems, but are communicating their thoughts about them, even though some of those communications are, at this point, predictable. It is also true that what's going to happen the rest of this afternoon is not going to be as predictable. That's why I'm very interested in ensuring that you leave this room immediately. Go! You won't collect your $200, but if you don't know where to go, you'll be told. You don't have long because I went beyond my time by about five minutes. Thank you for inviting me.

## GROUP DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

After Professor Ball's address, in which the major issues emanating from the School and College Panels were identified, conference participants formed into heterogenous groups to discuss these issues. Each group consisted of up to 10 persons. While Professor Ball's $200 was not collected, the groups formulated over 30 recommendations for improving the preparation of teachers for the teaching of reading. These recommendations were discussed in the closing session of the conference.

Below are the recommendations that were formulated by the various groups. Each group was asked to indicate their most important recommendation, and this appears as No. 1. Each group's recommendations are shown separately.

### Group Recommendations

1. It is essential that each student has had the opportunity to work with only competent teachers in the practising school.

2. The current practice of appointing supervising teachers should be re-considered in the light of the creation of a new position.

3. The new position might be known by the term Teacher Education Associate. The task of such a person would be to fulfil the mediating, leadership and interpretive roles needed to establish links between training institutions and training schools. In order to make this position attractive, the Teacher Education Associate would need to be guaranteed a combination of time off and higher emolument.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. An investigation of induction programs should be undertaken to help in developing a 'good' program.

2. Every primary and secondary school should have a language and reading policy for teachers of all subjects.

3. There should be greater liaison between schools, colleges of advanced education and universities.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. The three-year pre-service course leading to a diploma should be followed by a one-year in-service course leading to a degree.

2. In planning such a degree model, it is essential that the planning, implementation and evaluation be achieved by giving adequate attention to the views of all involved in the education process, including parents, students, teachers and administrators.

3. Teacher education in reading should place greater emphasis on the development of favourable attitudes in children towards reading.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. The needs of teachers in the teaching of reading are developmental and may be seen in the following stages -

   (i) pre-service;
   (ii) beginning teacher;
   (iii) limited-experienced teacher; and
   (iv) very-experienced teacher.

   These needs require a different training experience which would entail the three-level consideration of pre-service, induction and in-service.

2. Time should be given to a beginning teacher to become aware of the resources of the school prior to the commencement of his/her responsibilities.

3. All teachers should be given instruction in the teaching of reading, irrespective of their teaching subjects or level of responsibility.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. What makes an effective teacher of reading needs to be identified and defined.

2. It should be recognised that the beginning teacher is only part way along the continuum of growth.

3. There is a need to determine what is a reasonable expectation of the beginning teacher.

4. Schools should be responsible for teacher development through school-based in-service activities.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. A working relationship should be established between colleges and practising schools.

2. Colleges and the associated practising schools should co-operatively develop schedules of the systematic experiences which students are expected to undertake during the teaching of reading practice experiences.

3. Each school should recognise the need to develop its own carefully formulated reading policy.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. To deal with the problem of lack of communication between school, college and across colleges, each college should be responsible initially for co-ordinating a representative group to examine present content in reading courses. This knowledge should eventually be shared (through the Board of Teacher Education) with all colleges.

2. Courses should be introduced to ensure that teachers develop the abilities of children beyond the initial learning to read phase. Content area reading should be included as part of the program.

3. An investigation of major problems in program development (including the levels of readability in content area materials; the integration of these materials with commercial reading schemes; and selection of children's literature as a base for reading program development) should be undertaken.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. There should be longer periods of practice teaching with student teachers having defined areas of teaching for which they accept responsibility. Sandwich courses and internship may be ways of achieving this.

2. Both short and long-term interchange of staff between pre-schools, primary schools and secondary schools, on the one hand, and between tertiary institutions on the other, is needed.

3. There should be courses designed to integrate 'theory' and 'practice', e.g. lesson plans, where the student teachers, supervising teachers and lecturers meet at the end of practice to discuss and relate theory to practice.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. Colleges and schools should develop more effective systems to ensure that firstly, the practical program is planned, implemented and evaluated as a joint responsibility and, secondly, that the requirements and expectations of the practice program are known and understood by all parties involved.

   An attempt should be made by both college and school to develop a progressive record of what types of experiences (lessons, familiarisation with resources etc.) student teachers have been exposed to and that this information go with the student to the practising school to assist principals and supervising teachers in 'plugging the gaps' as the student's course develops.

2. Every teacher, irrespective of level and subject area, should receive instruction on language, language development and on the role played by language in learning. This would include training in such matters as the teaching of reading and writing, and the use of the four modes of language for learning.

3. Criteria should be established to clarify the expectations of both students and schools at the end of the three-year courses, during an induction period, and at the completion of a degree.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. Beginning teachers should be appointed to schools that 'care' and that are staffed more liberally. Failing that, each school should be responsible for its own induction program and for the formulation of its own reading policy.

2. Supervising teachers should be more carefully selected and receive some training in their role as supervising teachers.

3. In order to improve the liaison between tertiary institutions and schools, lecturers and students should work in schools for a substantial time each year.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. The Board of Teacher Education should consider the recommendations of the Bassett Committee report which relate to induction and devise means of implementing them as an integral part of the teacher education process.

2. All parties concerned in the efforts made to date in the in-service education of teachers in reading (in particular, in the establishment of the Reading Development Centre and in the policy of establishing Reading Resource Schools) should be continued, and even greater resources be devoted in future to an expansion and consolidation of this program to cover all metropolitan towns and provincial districts.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. A close working relationship should be established between colleges and schools (i.e. college staff planning with and teaching in schools) so that college students on practice perceive that there is a real working relationship. This would be of benefit to -

   (i) college staff;
   (ii) schools - improvement in quality of their programs, theory/practice relationship;
   (iii) students - practice becomes relevant and 'theory' becomes related to 'practice'; and
   (iv) pupils - benefit from combined expertise of school and college staff.

2. From this closer liaison, a core of teaching techniques should be defined. This will enable 'survival' in first term for the beginning teacher. This 'core' plus an understanding of the full implications for teaching in that area are the responsibility of the college of advanced education.

3. The schools and education system must provide the strategies to develop teachers from the core into the broader, more complete approach used by competent, experienced teachers.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Summary of Recommendations

In summary, an analysis of the group recommendations yields the following major points:

- There should be a closer working relationship between schools and teacher training institutions in the preparation of teachers for the teaching of reading. An investigation should be made of the ways in which 'theory' and 'practice' could be further integrated; and practical programs should be planned, implemented and evaluated jointly by colleges and schools.

- Training in the teaching of reading should be regarded as a continuous process throughout a teacher's career. An emphasis should be placed on the development of induction and in-service reading programs; practising school personnel should be carefully selected and receive training in their respective roles; and all schools (both primary and secondary) should formulate their own school reading policy.

## A FINAL STORY FROM PROFESSOR BALL

I thought that maybe you've had a long day, and so I might end with this story, which is a true story.

Reading is a process that does not begin when the kid comes to school as we pointed out a little while earlier, but it can be affected by television as I found out many years ago now in a previous life in the United States of America. This story concerns Sesame Street and how a particular two year old was able to demonstrate that the television show Sesame Street was having some impact on him. I'll tell you the story first of all and then I'll tell you the conclusion that I reach.

This was a little boy who was two years of age and had been spending some time watching Sesame Street. It was about the same time in his life when his mother was toilet training him, and one morning the little boy called out from the bathroom, 'Mummy, Mummy, come quick'. See, he was also doing some of those early reading books, so he spoke like that. So the Mother came into the bathroom and the little boy pointed at the potty and said, 'Do you know what that's called?'. Well she had had some training in Rogerian Client Centred Therapy and she was also rather puritanical and Victorian and didn't like to use certain words herself and was worried that he may have picked something up from one of those nasty little boys that lived down the street. There always is one of those. So she simply redirected the question and said, 'No dear, what is that called?'. And the little boy replied, 'That's the letter J'.

Now the point is that here was a two year old who was structuring his environment in a way quite different from the way he would have been if he hadn't had that mass media presentation going on. And I hope, in similar ways, that this meeting today will enable you, not quite the same way, but in similar ways, restructure your environments as you move back into wherever you come from professionally, that it will raise issues so that you'll start thinking slightly differently, and perhaps even not only think differently but do something. That, of course, would be perhaps one of the finest, unobtrusive measures that we could probably get if we could find out that you actually did something differently as a result of today. But I rather think that today isn't enough; and I rather think that nobody else agrees that today is enough. Do you want to look into the future? Good.

## SECTION III

## OUTLINE OF COURSES OFFERED IN THE TEACHING OF READING AND ASSOCIATED LANGUAGE SKILLS BY QUEENSLAND TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

## A. INTRODUCTION

In selecting and describing the courses included in this summary, the following steps were taken -

1. Courses in 'the teaching of reading and associated language skills' were first defined:

   - 'Associated language skills' was defined as those skills that are a pre-requisite to a child learning to read. Thus, such topics as the nature of language, language acquisition, language development, linguistics, sociology of language, psycholinguistics etc., were seen to be relevant. For the purpose of this exercise the other language arts such as writing, speaking (drama, etc.) and listening were not included in the definition. It is recognised, however, that this, of course, is an artificial boundary.

   - 'Teaching of reading' was defined as including such topics as the reading process, phonics, comprehension, study and library skills and the appreciation of children's literature.

2. 'Teaching of reading and associated language skills' courses were then identified from various course submissions received by the Board of Teacher Education (1). These were cross-checked using college handbooks and also any correspondence on the subject that had occurred between the Board and each college.

3. Draft course outlines were prepared for each college and sent to them for verification, approval and/or possible amendments.

4. Upon receipt of this advice from colleges, the outlines were compiled into the present format.

## B. NOTES ON COURSE OUTLINES

1. Where the majority of a course appears to fit the definition of 'teaching of reading and associated language skills' as defined above, the course is named and described. Where only a part of the course appears to suit the definition, the name of the course is preceded by 'ELEMENTS OF . . . . .'.

2. Where the Board of Teacher Education received a new or revised college course submission between July 1977 (the commencement of the reading project) and December 1979, a brief comparison is made between pre-service compulsory courses offered in 1977 and those proposed or offered now. (2) (It will have been observed that the survey mainly concentrated on pre-service teacher education.)

3. It will be noted that there are less compulsory 'reading and language' courses offered in in-service programs than in pre-service ones. This is due in large part to the nature of in-service programs in which most compulsory courses concentrate on educational and curriculum foundation courses. The electives then specialise in catering for individual needs and/or interests.

(1) Every five years, teacher education courses offered by colleges are assessed by the Board's Course Assessment Committee. A further assessment of a course may be made by the committee upon its first output of graduates. (From 1980, this latter aspect will no longer be mandatory, but the Committee will retain the right to request or review a teacher education program at any time.) Upon the assessment of a teacher education course, the Course Assessment Committee makes recommendations to the Board of Teacher Education. The Board, in turn, makes recommendations to the Board of Advanced Education concerning the accreditation of the teacher education award (Dip.T. (Primary) etc.). In addition to this function, the Course Assessment Committee of the Board of Teacher Education makes recommendations to the Board of Teacher Education on the accreditation of all pre-service teacher education courses for the purposes of teacher registration.

(2) A brief comparison of 1977 and 1979 pre-service compulsory courses offered at the University of Queensland and James Cook University of North Queensland is also given.

## C. COURSE OUTLINES

### BRISBANE KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS COLLEGE

1. **DIPLOMA OF TEACHING - DIP.T. (EARLY CHILDHOOD) - a three-year pre-service course.**

This course was first accredited in 1975 and commenced first semester 1976.

1.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses specifically on the teaching of reading. The study of language, however, is integrated in the Education Studies and Child Development units.

1.2 Elective courses

READING FOR THE YOUNG CHILD (48 HOURS)

This course aims to develop the necessary understandings and skills of reading instruction for teachers of children in kindergarten, pre-school or primary years. The requisites of formal and informal reading are presented. Particular emphasis is placed upon foundational skills, teaching approaches, diagnostic methods and placement procedures.

2. **UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF TEACHING - DIP.T. (EARLY CHILDHOOD) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.**

This diploma was reaccredited in 1978 and commenced first semester 1979.

2.1 Compulsory courses

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION (48 HOURS)

This course aims to give an awareness of the functions and varieties of language, and its communicative and heuristic roles in educational situations. An attempt is made to integrate theory with practice. Topics covered include: The nature of language; language variation and English; language acquisition; language and values; language and reading; and literature and language.

DEVELOPMENTAL READING (48 HOURS)

This course serves to update and extend teachers' knowledge of reading. Reading is viewed as the source of literacy. The relatedness of writing and reading for the beginning reader is emphasised.

2.2 Elective courses

THE SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE (48 HOURS)

This course is concerned with the study of some of the more influential sociolinguistic theories and their implications for early childhood education. As well as a discussion of the literature, real life language situations will be projected into the workshop sessions. Special attention is paid to child-mother interactions, children's peer group talk, and child-teacher interchanges. Topics include: social phenomenology, language and education; ethnomethodology; Bernstein's socio-linguistic theory of language learning; and language, deprivation and compensatory education.

## CAPRICORNIA INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. **DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.**

This diploma was accredited in 1975 and commenced first semester 1976. The institute is now planning a review of the diploma with a view to reaccreditation in 1981.

### 1.1 Compulsory courses

DEVELOPMENTAL READING (84 HOURS)

This subject aims to develop students' knowledge of the 'reading' literature and the philosophies and materials of the major approaches to the teaching of reading; and to provide a practicum in the teaching of reading to children in local schools.

ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM STUDIES II (14 HOURS IN LANGUAGE ARTS)

A one semester hour is devoted to a study of the Language Arts Curriculum Guide. The topics covered include detailed analysis and consideration of the syllabus, the skills needed in implementing each syllabus, media and materials in implementing the syllabi and the role of the teacher as interpreter of the syllabus.

ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM STUDIES III (TOTAL COURSE = 84 HOURS)

This subject includes a curriculum contract component which integrates practical experience with theory work in the eight areas of the curriculum studied at the institute.

ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (TOTAL COURSE = 28 HOURS)

This course consists of one hour/week for two semesters which deals with the practical problems confronting the beginning teacher. A series of problem-solving simulations deal with such concerns as initial preparations, timetabling, C.C.P., reading and grouping.

### 1.2 Elective courses

PSYCHOLOGY OF LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT (42 HOURS)

This course aims to investigate and consider aspects of the acquisition, development and use of language. Topics included will be linguistic data, linguistic theories and sequence of language development.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (42 HOURS)

This subject is concerned with a basic understanding of children's literature, a knowledge of the books that children are reading, and the skills needed to introduce and promote children's reading experiences.

2. **UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.**

The diploma was accredited in 1976 and commenced in 1977. This course was reviewed in 1979 following the first output of graduates.

### 2.1 Compulsory courses

LANGUAGE AND LITERACY (56 HOURS)

This course includes the following topics: the nature of language; ways in which a child acquires language; ways in which a child acquires literacy; and ways in which a child extends and enjoys literacy.

2.2 Elective courses

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT II - LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM (28 HOURS)

This is one of the eight courses from which students must elect to undertake two courses. This course investigates a child's verbal communication system; and curriculum development of the child's communication through language arts.

3. BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a further one year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.

This degree was first accredited in 1978 and commenced first semester 1979.

3.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

3.2 Elective courses

STUDIES IN CURRICULUM - LANGUAGE (56 HOURS)

This subject aims to increase students' familiarity with concepts and processes involved in selecting, implementing and evaluating learning experiences in language education for primary school children; a sensitivity to the needs of the learner as he learns language; and an appreciation of the importance of meeting the needs of the language learner. The content includes an investigation of the concepts, processes and special considerations required for an understanding of the primary language curriculum.

STUDIES IN CURRICULUM - READING (56 HOURS)

This subject aims to foster a deeper understanding of reading as a cognitive process; to view reading in relation to other communication skills; to develop a set of criteria for examining different approaches to the teaching of reading; to explore the value of an 'eclectic approach' towards the teaching of reading; and to design a reading program for a clearly defined sector of the primary school.

ISSUES IN READING INSTRUCTION (56 HOURS)

The content for this subject includes: social implications of reading; ways that reading is taught; examining reading failure and looking for causation; and an examination of questions needing further research.

## DARLING DOWNS INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.

This diploma was accredited in 1974 and reaccredited 1976. The college is now planning a review of the diploma with a view to reaccreditation in 1981.

1.1 Compulsory courses

. In 1975, when the accredited course commenced, 33 hours was devoted to the teaching of reading in a single course. In the revisions of 1976/77,

the number of compulsory hours devoted to language and reading was increased to 132 hours.

- In 1979, the following compulsory courses in language and reading were offered:

LANGUAGE AND READING I (66 HOURS)

This unit gives emphasis to the intra and extra school factors which influence the development of language ability in children. The unit also provides basic information in the following areas: (a) beginning reading; (b) skills of reading; (c) developmental reading.

LANGUAGE AND READING II (33 HOURS)

Creative teaching of the language arts is the central theme of this course. Workshop sessions, demonstrations and activities will emphasise the areas of the school writing program, program evaluation and course design in language arts. Emphasis is also given to various methods and approaches in the teaching of reading and how successful these are in dealing with the issues raised in the first year course.

LANGUAGE AND READING III (33 HOURS)

This course concentrates on the various methods of teaching reading with particular emphasis on use and knowledge of children's literature.

ELEMENTS OF DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT OF LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (TOTAL COURSE = 33 HOURS)

This course aims to equip students with the skills and understanding to be able to identify, diagnose and teach children with learning difficulties in the normal classroom.

1.2 Elective courses

SOCIOLINGUISTICS (33 HOURS)

This subject centres around the works of Bernstein. It focusses on the differences in language growth and development produced by different social, cultural and cognitive environments.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN EDUCATION A (33 HOURS)

This subject emphasises the use of children's literature in the lower school curriculum both in terms of designing instructional strategies and as an aid to reading instruction.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN EDUCATION B (33 HOURS)

This subject emphasises the use of children's literature in the middle and upper school curriculum both in terms of designing instructional strategies and as an aid to reading instruction.

2. UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.

This diploma was accredited in 1976 and commenced first semester 1977. It was reviewed in 1979 following the first output of graduates.

2.1 Compulsory courses

ELEMENTS OF THE TEACHING LEARNING PROCESS (TOTAL COURSE = 66 HOURS)

This unit focusses on how children function in the teaching learning process by reference to a teaching model. Here an important emphasis is placed upon the psychological bases of reading.

ELEMENTS OF THE DEVELOPING CHILD (TOTAL COURSE = 66 HOURS)

This unit which looks at child development has a focus on language development, both from a psychological and sociological perspective.

2.2 Elective courses

LANGUAGE AND CHILDREN'S LITERATURE IN EDUCATION (66 HOURS)

Selection and use of children's literature in the school is the focus of this unit. Development of language through literature is also emphasised.

ELEMENTS OF LEARNING DIFFICULTIES (TOTAL COURSE = 66 HOURS)

The focus of this course is the identification, diagnosis and treatment of learning difficulties. Problems in learning to read form an important part of the topics studied.

3. **BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a further one year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.**

This degree was accredited in 1977 and commenced first semester 1978. It was reviewed in 1979 following the first output of graduates.

3.1 Compulsory courses

There are no courses specifically on the teaching of reading and language. However, in CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (198 HOURS) students may elect to specialise in Language Arts which is one of six areas that may be chosen (the other areas being Physical Education; Social Studies; Science; Creative Arts and Mathematics.

3.2 Elective courses

Students may elect to undertake an INDEPENDENT STUDY in 'Language in Education'. This is one of nine areas that may be chosen.

## JAMES COOK UNIVERSITY OF NORTH QUEENSLAND

1. **BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a four-year pre-service course training secondary school teachers.**

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, reading was briefly treated in a Curriculum Studies course which was compulsory only for those students who would teach secondary English. This amounted to only three hours in total.
- In 1979, the following compulsory course was offered for the first time for all students:

LANGUAGE, READING AND EDUCATION (36 HOURS)

In this course, topics include a study of: language elements and functions; language acquisition and development; language and thought; language and social class; writing and the sense of audience; communication and learning in small groups; the language of subject - specific instruction; the reading process; models of reading; reading in content areas; organisational strategies for a language and reading policy across the curriculum of secondary education.

1.2 Elective courses

LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND EDUCATION (60 HOURS)

This course combines lectures and workshops in an examination of the psychological and linguistic bases of second-language learning and acquisition; psychological, anthropological approaches to education; selected aspects of bi-lingualism in relation to English - second-language methods of teaching; material selection, adaptation and development; and second language English testing. (Note: This course will not be offered in 1980).

2. DIPLOMA OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND MASTER OF EDUCATION (SPECIAL EDUCATION) - one-year postgraduate courses.

These full-year courses include such aspects as diagnostic testing, and remedial programs which have a heavy emphasis on the teaching of reading, and the diagnosis and remediation of reading problems.

## KELVIN GROVE COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.

This diploma was reaccredited in 1979 for commencement in 1980.

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In March 1978, the amount of hours devoted to the teaching of reading was estimated by lecturers to be 123 hours.
- The revised diploma to commence in 1980 includes the following courses:

THE TEACHING OF READING (60 HOURS)

This is a foundation course in the teaching of reading. The course aims to give students an understanding of theories concerning the reading process and of how these may be translated into classroom practice. Topics include: the relationship of reading to language development; the inter-relatedness of theoretical models and various approaches to the teaching of reading; directed reading - thinking activities; observing children's reading behaviour in the classroom; the concept of readability in classroom materials; and classroom organisation for reading instruction and resources for the teaching of reading, including commercial reading schemes, children's literature and content area materials.

INDIVIDUALISED READING INSTRUCTION (45 HOURS)

This course is designed to equip the teacher with the skills necessary to teach exceptional children in the classroom. Areas of study include the assessment of the individual pupil in relation to interest, academic ability, cultural and language background; and the matching of these needs with specific and appropriate individual instructional techniques and materials.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM STUDIES I (TOTAL COURSE = 60 HOURS)

This foundation unit introduces students to the theory and practice in the teaching of Language Arts in the primary school. There are four modules to the course. Module I includes the nature, structure and functions of language; language acquisition/development; and simple models to

emphasise how language is used for communication. Module III includes an introduction to the reading and writing processes; the relationship between reading and writing; and the relationship between reading, writing and experiential background.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM STUDIES III (TOTAL COURSE = 60 HOURS)

This unit focusses on developing and evaluating units of work through the primary school. In this course, students develop and apply criteria to evaluate Language Arts curriculum guides. They write a model current curriculum program for a specific level; and also develop integrated Language Arts units for any level of the primary school.

1.2 Elective courses

LINGUISTICS OF ENGLISH (30 HOURS)

This course is intended for students who have shown a special interest in and aptitude for language study. It includes both a study of the traditional and transformational grammar viewpoints.

THE SOCIOLOGY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERACY (30 HOURS)

This course takes a critical look at the relationship between language varieties and social stratification. The issues underlying the literacy controversy are also examined.

LANGUAGE AND LEARNING (45 HOURS)

This subject involves students in analysing samples of children's language within a language and learning framework. Topics include: how language is structured; language history and change; language acquisition and development; and language in education.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (EARLY CHILDHOOD) (30 HOURS)

This course aims to extend the knowledge of children's literature gained in compulsory courses. Topics include: the reading needs and interests of young children; evaluative criteria for children's books; nursery rhymes and poetry; folk and fairy tales; contemporary picture books; non-fiction for young readers; integration of children's literature with other curriculum areas; and the literature program for young children.

VOLUNTEER ADULT TUTORING PROGRAMS (30 HOURS)

Students work with adults who have reading problems. They attend two hours per week with the lecturer and then tutor in their spare time.

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (MIDDLE AND PRIMARY) (30 HOURS)

Topics in this course include: the evaluation of children's books; selection tools; quality books versus inferior series and comics; longer picture books and illustration; books to foster the enjoyment of independent reading in grades 3 and 4; Australian children's books; folktales; and the literature program in the primary school.

2. DIPLOMA OF SECONDARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - a three-year pre-service course.

This diploma was reaccredited in 1979 for commencement in 1980.

2.1 Compulsory courses

. In March 1978, the college reported that a 28-hour Reading across the Content Areas course was offered.

- The revised diploma, for introduction in 1980, will include the following compulsory course:

  COMMUNICATION II, READING IN THE CONTENT AREA (30 HOURS)

  This unit considers the relationship between verbal and written communication and their implications for the secondary class teacher. The course aims to develop an understanding of the need to match curriculum materials to individual (school) student ability.

- The following courses are compulsory for those students with English as one of their teaching areas:

  READING NEEDS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS (45 HOURS)

  This unit aims to provide future teachers of English with the expertise and theoretical background necessary to establish a developmental reading program in the secondary school. Topics include a review of current theories of the reading process; a consideration of the range, possibilities and limitations of commercial materials; and the development of skills for assessing the needs of students and to devise appropriate programs.

  ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDIES II (TOTAL COURSE = 30 HOURS)

  The four language arts (listening, speaking, reading and writing) are used as the basis for developing a checklist of process and content areas which constitute the secondary English syllabus. Part of the section on reading covers the comprehension of non-fiction prose through directed reading activities. This leads into the unit 'Communication II', where a major concern is reading in the content area.

2.2 Elective courses

LANGUAGE AND LEARNING (45 HOURS)

VOLUNTEER ADULT TUTORING PROGRAM (30 HOURS)

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (EARLY CHILDHOOD) (30 HOURS)

CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (MIDDLE AND UPPER PRIMARY) (30 HOURS)

The above courses are described in 1.2 above.

ELEMENTS OF PRIORITIES IN ENGLISH TEACHING (30 HOURS)

This is a workshop oriented curriculum development unit in which English units are developed on a nominated priority. One of the priorities is reading improvement. If such a unit is developed, it is related also to adolescent language development.

3. GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN SECONDARY TEACHING - GRAD.DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - a one-year end-on pre-service course.

This diploma was accredited in 1974 and commenced 1975. The following courses are offered:

3.1 Compulsory courses

- There are no compulsory courses for all students, offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.
- The following course is compulsory for those students who are preparing to be teachers of English:

ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH (TOTAL COURSE = 57 HOURS)

Part of this curriculum course attempts to help students to clarify their concept of the role of the English teacher in the process of language learning, in the light of current knowledge about language and the way in which it is acquired. Another section deals with creating a context so that reading is a purposeful activity.

3.2 Elective courses

There are no elective courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

4. UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY OR SECONDARY TEACHING - DIP.T.(PRIMARY) OR DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.

This diploma was accredited in 1975 and commenced second semester of the same year. It was reviewed in 1978 following the first output of graduates.

4.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading or language.

4.2 Elective courses

FOUNDATIONS OF READING INSTRUCTION (FRL 851) (45 HOURS)

This subject provides a foundation study in the teaching of reading in the primary school. Topics include: people and reading process; development stages in reading; methods and materials; and n introduction to organisation of a reading program.

INDIVIDUALISING READING INSTRUCTION (IRL) (45 HOURS)

This subject aims to provide teachers with skills which will assist them in the assessment of reading language needs of their pupils so as to lead to individualised reading instruction.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This subject includes an examination of the complexity of the reading process and implications for the primary school; classroom practices for corrective and remedial reading; and children's literature.

5. BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a further one-year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.

This degree was accredited and commenced in 1977. It was reviewed in 1978 following the first output of graduates.

5.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

5.2 Elective courses

FOUNDATIONS OF READING INSTRUCTION (FRL 981) (45 HOURS)

The content of this course includes reading and the teaching of reading; the reading learner and the developmental stages in reading; teaching strategies and materials for developing a class reading program; and the total reading environment of the school.

READING IN THE SECONDARY CLASSROOM (45 HOURS)

ELEMENTS OF APPLIED CURRICULUM STUDIES IN PRIMARY LANGUAGE ARTS (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This subject extends the knowledge of options and range of desirable practices for teachers of the language arts in the primary school. Reading is discussed along with the other areas of language arts.

## McAULEY COLLEGE

1. **DIPLOMA IN PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.**

This diploma was accredited in 1976 and commenced first semester 1979.

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, reading mainly formed part of the Language Arts curriculum studies courses in the first two years of the diploma. The amount of time devoted to the teaching of reading in these courses was estimated by lecturers to be 18-22 hours.
- The revised Dip.T. (Primary) will offer the following courses:

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS EDUCATION I (TOTAL COURSE = 28 HOURS)

In this unit, the first year student examines the nature and function of language and language acquisition. The emphasis in the unit is on language and reading development in early childhood. The content includes language development; social aspects of language; language and reading; written language; and language and the school curriculum.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS EDUCATION II (TOTAL COURSE = 28 HOURS)

This unit deals with language skills in the primary years (particularly middle and upper schools) and emphasises the expressive areas of language and the organisation of reading and writing activities. It focusses on the implementation of the Queensland Language Arts Primary Syllabus for the development of child's mental skills, emotional development and his aesthetic and spiritual values. The contents of the subject include: developing reading skills; developing written expression; developing the skills of written expression; and the Language Arts program.

ELEMENTS OF PRACTICAL STUDIES III (10 HOURS IN READING)

This third year course has a close relationship with Language Arts Education III and Curriculum Studies III. Its focus is on observation and analysis of pupil error; the designing of remedial experiences for specific error patterns; gaining experience in working with personnel associated with such work in the wider community; and becoming competent in communicating with parents about involvement in school reading programs and actually involving them in those programs.

LANGUAGE ARTS EDUCATION III - READING (28 HOURS)

This third year unit provides opportunities for student teachers to develop a personal approach to the teaching of reading based on the study of research into theoretical models of the reading process and investigation of a variety of teaching strategies aimed at helping the

child develop fluency in reading. The contents of the course include: the reading process; the analysis of reading behaviour, comprehending in reading; and assisting reading.

1.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF DEVELOPMENTAL ELECTIVE STUDIES (TOTAL COURSE = 28 HOURS)

One of the eight topics covered in this subject is Language Development from 2 to 8 years of age.

2. UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.

This diploma was accredited first in 1979 and commenced second semester 1979.

2.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

2.2 Elective courses

Students must select one of four curriculum areas (Religion, Language Arts, Social Studies and Mathematics) and study two units in this area. If a student chooses Language Arts, he/she would study the following subjects:

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS I (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

In this subject, the student will examine the nature and functions of language and language acquisition. The emphasis is on the expressive areas of language, language structures, the developmental sequences in the speaking and writing processes and the organisation of speaking and writing activities.

LANGUAGE ARTS II - READING IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL (45 HOURS)

This unit provides opportunities for teachers to develop a personal approach to the teaching of reading based on the study of research into theoretical models of the reading process and investigation of a variety of teaching strategies aimed at helping the child develop fluency in reading. Topics include: the reading process; the analysis of reading behaviour; comprehending in reading; and organising the development of reading.

## MOUNT GRAVATT COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.

This diploma was reaccredited in 1978 and commenced first semester 1979.

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, reading was part of a compulsory Language Arts 45 hour course. 'Writing' was also considered in this subject.
- The revised Dip.T. (Primary) offers the following compulsory courses:

LANGUAGE IN TEACHING (45 HOURS)

This course is a pre-requisite to all other courses in the language arts and introduces students to key concepts concerning the nature and function of language. Topics include: the nature of language; the sound system of English; approaches to syntax; words; the lexicon; semantics; and language in use.

READING A (45 HOURS)

This course aims to provide all students with a basic grounding in reading practice. Topics include: early reading; methods of teaching early reading; organising the reading program; and integration with other language arts.

READING B (45 HOURS)

This course is developmentally based on the pre-requisite courses, Language in Teaching and Reading A. It focusses, particularly, on the development of fluent reading beyond the initial stages. Topics include: the fluent reading process; teaching for comprehension; the purposes of reading; matching materials to readers; diagnosis and remediation in reading; and the teacher and the reading program.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

The essential focus of this course is to offer content in the areas of written expression and children's literature. In the children's literature section, the following topics are covered: the art of the picture story book; critically evaluating children's literature; strategies of using children's literature; objectives of a literature program for the upper primary; evaluating and using information books; folk-lore, myths and legends; children's reading interests; Australian children's literature; and media and children's literature.

1.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF TECHNIQUES OF REMEDIATION IN THE CLASSROOM (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This course aims to make students aware of new developments as well as time-tested techniques for helping children/adults with learning difficulties. Topics include: community concern regarding children/adults with learning disabilities; introduction to diagnostic procedures; review of current instructional systems; remediation - a place to start; specific techniques in remediation; evaluation in remediation; individualising instruction in the classroom; and preventive teaching.

EVALUATIVE TEACHING OF LITERACY (90 HOURS)

This is a two semester course designed to provide practical experience in working with atypical children in a language development and reading program; and on the basis of that experience, in developing strategies and the required materials to adapt that program to the needs of those particular children. Topics include: the oral language of children; building literacy or oracy; and modifying teaching programs.

2. DIPLOMA OF SECONDARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - a three-year pre-service course.

This diploma was reaccredited in 1979.

2.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, the study of reading and language was compulsory only for those students preparing to teach English.

- The revised Dip.T. (Secondary) offers the following compulsory course to all students:

  DEVELOPING BASIC COMPETENCIES (60 HOURS)

  Fifty hours of this course are devoted to 'language and literacy'. Topics include: language and its development; strategies for developing oral language abilities; developing reading abili y; and strategies for writing development. Students spend a further 10 hours in the course studying either 'numeracy' or 'further diagnosis and remediation of literacy problems' according to what is most appropriate for a student's 'content rea' subject.

- The following course is compulsory for all students preparing to teach secondary English:

  ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDIES A (TOTAL COURSE = 60 HOURS)

  Topics covered in this course include: language and learning; language and literature; teaching strategies for listening and speaking development; teaching strategies for reading development; and teaching strategies for writing development.

2.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF TECHNIQUES OF REMEDIATION IN THE CLASSROOM (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This course is similar to the course of the same name described in 1.2 above.

3. GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN SECONDARY TEACHING - GRAD. DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - **a concurrent program in association with Griffith University, the teacher training component being equivalent to three semesters full-time.**

This diploma was first accredited in 1976 and commenced in 1977. It was reviewed in 1979, following the first output of graduates.

3.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, the study of reading and language was compulsory only for those students preparing to teach English. This situation has not changed.
- The 'first graduate' review of the Graduate Dip.T. (Secondary) offers the following compulsory course for students preparing to teach English in the secondary school:

  ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDIES A (TOTAL COURSE = 60 HOURS)

  This course is described in 2.1 above.

3.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF TECHNIQUES OF REMEDIATION IN THE CLASSROOM (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This course is similar to the course of the same name described in 1.2 above.

4. **UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY OR SECONDARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) OR DIP.T. (SECONDARY) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.**

This diploma was first accredited in 1976 and commenced first semester 1977. In May 1979 the college submitted a 'first graduate' review of the award which contains the following relevant course offerings:

4.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses specifically on the teaching of reading and language for either the upgrading 'primary' or 'secondary' Dip.T.

4.2 Elective courses

The following electives are offered to those students undertaking either the upgrading 'primary' or 'secondary' Dip.T:

ENGLISH LANGUAGE (30 HOURS)

This course is similar in design to 'Language in Teaching' described above in 1.1.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND THE TEACHING OF READING (45 HOURS)

This course aims to give students an understanding of the reading process through an analysis of several reading models. Various approaches to the teaching of beginning reading are discussed and the reading series and schemes most popular in Queensland schools are examined and assessed.

ELEMENTS OF DESIGNING PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING PROBLEMS (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This course is similar in design to 'Techniques of Remediation in the Classroom' described above in 1.2.

ELEMENTS OF MODERN DEVELOPMENTS IN ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDIES (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

In this subject, students may select 'reading' as their core interest area (the other areas being writing, drama and media). Approximately 75 percent of the course is devoted to the core interest area.

5. **BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a further one-year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.**

This degree was first accredited in 1976, and commenced first semester 1977. In May 1979, the college submitted a 'first graduate' review of the award which contains the following relevant course offerings:

5.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses specifically on the teaching of reading and language.

5.2 Elective courses

UNDERSTANDING LANGUAGE AND READING (45 HOURS)

This course consists of two interrelated strands: (A) Language Research Strand; (B) Reading Behaviour Strand. The two strands support one another in forming a basis on which students examine a language/reading program.

MODERN LINGUISTIC STUDIES (45 HOURS)

This course aims to make the student aware of modern developments in linguistics and language study. The contents include: a general survey of theoretical linguistics; more extensive reading in one component of the language model; and more concentrated work on one section of that component.

SOCIOLINGUISTICS (45 HOURS)

This course aims to establish a better understanding of society and language. Topics include: causes, nature and status of varieties and registers; effect of the language spoken on the individual's world view; the characteristics of one variety of English; and one other area such as language change, bilingualism or language planning.

ELEMENTS OF COMPARATIVE ENGLISH CURRICULUM STUDIES (TOTAL COURSE = 45 HOURS)

This course focusses specifically on aspects of curriculum pertinent to the teaching of English at both primary and secondary levels. Relevant t opics include: language acquisition and development; the reading process and reading for comprehension; and literature and its role in children's development.

APPLIED LINGUISTICS (45 HOURS)

This course is intended for teachers interested in the application of insights gained from the linguistic sciences to the solution of language related 'problems'. Topics include: the nature of applied linguistics; the history of applied linguistics; applied linguistics in operation; and application of applied linguistics.

6. **GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN READING - a two-year part-time in-service course for graduates.**

This diploma was accredited in 1976 and commenced 1977. This course was reviewed in 1979 following the first output of graduates. The following topics are covered:

(a) Psychological Foundations of Reading

(b) The Nature of Language

(c) The Process of Reading

(d) Psycholinguistics

(e) Principles Underlying Classroom Instruction in Reading

(f) The Reading Program: policies and philosophies of teaching reading; criteria for selection and use of materials.

(g) Materials Evaluation Seminar

(h) Current Developments in Reading and Reading Research.

## NORTH BRISBANE COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. **DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.**

This diploma was reaccredited in 1979.

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, reading mainly formed part of the following compulsory core subjects: Early Childhood Education - Lower Primary; Language Methods; and Modern Developments in Primary Education. The diploma course was estimated by lecturers to have approximately 75 actual 'reading' hours drawn from these subjects.
- The revised Dip.T. (Primary) offers the following courses:

FOUNDATION CURRICULUM STUDIES IIIB - READING EDUCATION (42 HOURS)

This third year course offers a sequential study of various dimensions of reading development and their practical application to the classroom situation. An emphasis is placed on the developmental nature of the reading process. There are five modules: child language and reading; the teaching of reading; the teaching of reading to children with special needs; children's literature; and the reading curriculum.

THE EXPERIENCE OF LANGUAGE (42 HOURS)

The unit provides students with an appropriate foundation for an understanding of their own language processes, forms and structures and those used by children in a wide range of situations. This foundation also incorporates knowledge of language acquisition and development. The unit works in close harmony with the Reading and Language Arts components of the Curriculum Studies units.

ELEMENTS OF FOUNDATION CURRICULUM STUDIES I, IIa AND IIb (TOTAL COURSES = 168 HOURS)

Foundation Curriculum Studies aim to lay the foundations for successful curriculum involvement. Over 45 hours are devoted to language and reading. Students are introduced to modules of learning experiences which can be utilised in practical situations.

ELEMENTS OF SCHOOL STUDIES I AND II (14 HOURS IN READING)

The two School Studies units provide an opportunity for students to work with college staff and co-operating teachers in an examination of primary school curricula in an actual school context. The 'Reading Education' unit is given particular attention and practical relevance in the school where students are required to: (i) critically evaluate reading schemes being used by the class; (ii) complete a detailed case study on a child experiencing reading difficulties; and (iii) develop reading programs for lower, middle and upper primary levels. In School Studies II also, the elements of reading and language undertaken in Foundation Curriculum Studies are also given practical relevance.

ELEMENTS OF LEARNING DIAGNOSIS AND INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM PLANNING (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS COLLEGE-BASED)

The major emphasis in this study is to provide students with theoretical and practical approaches to curriculum planning and implementation for a wide variety of learners. Part of the course is devoted to the rationale, administration and interpretation of various testing instruments. In the schools, students will then develop appropriate individual programs. Particular attention will be paid to language and reading development.

1.2 Elective courses

DEVELOPMENTAL READING (42 HOURS)

This extended study of the reading process forms the basis for selected research projects and for the development of reading materials suitable for use with groups of children in the classroom.

ELEMENTS OF ADVANCED LANGUAGE ARTS PROGRAMMING (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS)

This unit is offered for those students who wish to specialise in Language Arts studies of an advanced level. Part of the course is devoted to resources available in Language Arts, with an emphasis on children's literature. Some issues in Language Arts are discussed including the 'basics debate' and the 'phonics' versus other methods of teaching reading.

ELEMENTS OF LIBRARY RESOURCES AND METHOD (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS)

This unit is designed to make pre-service students aware of the features which enter into the design of effective school library programs and of the organisation and selection processes which support these programs. Part of the course is devoted to an examination of the role of the library in the primary school, with reference to children's skills of retrieval and of using library resources.

ELEMENTS OF GUIDANCE AND REMEDIAL EDUCATION (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS)

Part of this course is devoted to the following topics: the remedial child; remedial and corrective teaching; and techniques in remedial teaching in which the emphasis is placed on language rather than number problems, and on the lower primary child. Some recent theories in the remediation of language disabilities are also discussed.

ELEMENTS OF LITERATURE (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS)

This unit aims to study in some depth a chosen period or genre and its cultural environment. In any one semester, one chosen period or genre is presented. Children's literature is one of four areas which could be studied. (The other three topics are: American literature from c. 1850 to the present; Australian literature and film of the 20th century; and twentieth century women writers.)

2. GRADUATE DIPLOMA IN PRIMARY TEACHING - GRAD. DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a one-year end-on pre-service course.

This diploma was reaccredited in 1979.

2.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, college lecturers estimated that the total number of hours devoted to the teaching of reading (drawn from various courses) in the graduate diploma was 25 hours.
- The revised Grad. Dip.T. (Primary) offers the following courses:

ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM STUDIES I AND II (4 HOURS IN LANGUAGE ARTS)

ELEMENTS OF SCHOOL STUDIES I AND II (14 HOURS IN READING)

ELEMENTS OF LEARNING DIAGNOSIS AND INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM PLANNING (TOTAL COURSE = 42 HOURS COLLEGE-BASED)

These courses are similar to those described in 1.1 above.

STUDIES IN CURRICULUM III - READING EDUCATION (42 HOURS)

This course is similar to the 'Foundation Curriculum Studies III B - Reading Education' course which is described in 1.1 above.

2.2 Elective courses

DEVELOPMENTAL READING (42 HOURS)

ELEMENTS OF LIBRARY RESOURCES AND METHODS

ELEMENTS OF GUIDANCE AND REMEDIAL EDUCATION

These courses are described in 1.2 above.

3. UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - **a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.**

This diploma was first accredited in 1976 and introduced in first semester 1977. In August 1979 the college submitted a 'first graduate' review of the award which contains the following relevant course offerings:

3.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

3.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF TEACHING AND LEARNING IN THE PRIMARY SCHOOL (APPROX. 14 HOURS IN READING)

With this compulsory unit, students may select an elective module 'Reading Education', which accounts for one-third of the course.

ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM STUDIES - UNIT A

This unit integrates the four components of the language arts (listening/observing, speaking, reading and writing).

ELEME S OF LANGUAGE ARTS CURRICULUM STUDIES - UNIT B

One half of this unit concentrates on the development of basic communication skills in children with emphasis on reading and writing; and the other half, drama in education.

4. BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - **a further one-year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.**

This degree was accredited in 1977 and commenced in 1979.

4.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

4.2 Elective courses

ELEMENTS OF CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT (TOTAL COURSE = 135 HOURS)

Curriculum Development consists of three units (out of the eight) in the B.Ed. degree. In one of these units, students may choose to devote approximately half their time to Language Arts as the content for curriculum analysis and modification. In a second unit, students devote a substantial part of their time to an individual curriculum project which could also embrace the language arts.

## TOWNSVILLE COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

1. **DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a three-year pre-service course.**

This diploma was reaccredited in 1977 and commenced first semester 1978.

1.1 Compulsory courses

ELEMENTS OF LL110 LANGUAGE ARTS (TOTAL COURSE = 65 HOURS)

This introductory unit focusses on the development of an understanding of language and its role in the interpretation and communication of the child's experience, the interrelatedness of the various areas of the language arts, the language skills that a child needs to acquire, and the methods of developing these skills effectively in the classroom. Specific consideration is given to the expressive areas of language, namely, speaking and writing.

LL210 LANGUAGE ARTS (65 HOURS)

LL210 focusses specifically on the teaching of reading at all levels of the primary school. Emphasis is on the developmental aspects of reading, the reading process and reading skills. The interrelatedness between reading and other areas of the language arts is considered. Areas of study include: reading and objectives; language development and reading; word recognition and comprehension; reading in the content areas; organising and diagnosing reading ability; and motivation and development in reading.

1.2 Elective courses

LL311 LANGUAGE ARTS (39 HOURS)

This course is concerned with language development and improvement of reading in the primary school. Topics include: perception and reading; language and reading; word recognition and meaning; development and reading; comprehension and communication; evaluation and diagnosis of reading.

ELEMENTS OF DIAGNOSTIC METHODS AND REMEDIAL TEACHING (TOTAL COURSE = 39 HOURS)

The focus of this unit is on remediating the underachiever in the basic subject areas of reading, mathematics, spelling and oral and written expression. Areas of study include the nature of underachievement; assessment procedures; prescriptive remedial approaches; and organisation concerns.

ELEMENTS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION (TOTAL COURSE = 39 HOURS)

A part of this course is devoted to the topic 'language, social class and socialisation'.

2. **UPGRADING DIPLOMA OF PRIMARY TEACHING - DIP.T. (PRIMARY) - a one-year (or part-time equivalent) in-service course.**

This diploma was accredited in 1976 and commenced first semester 1977. It was reviewed in 1979, following the first output of graduates.

2.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

2.2 Elective courses

Students must elect to study two subjects in curriculum studies. The following courses are two of eight that may be chosen:

LL351 LANGUAGE ARTS B (45 HOURS)

This course is concerned with language development and improvement in the teaching of reading in the primary school. Topics include: perception and reading; language and reading; skill development programs; comprehension improvement; oral reading and the development of interest in reading; and evaluation and diagnosis of the language arts.

LL365 CHILDREN'S LITERATURE (45 HOURS)

This unit is an advanced study in the teaching of Language Arts with particular reference to children's literature. The course aims to develop knowledge in the field of children's literature; a sensitivity to imaginative writing; and skills necessary for the effective use of children's literature in the classroom. This course is an elective offered as a special interest study.

3. BACHELOR OF EDUCATION - B.ED. - a further one-year's study (or part-time equivalent) following the Diploma of Teaching and at least one year's teaching.

This degree was accredited in 1977 and commenced first semester 1978. It was reviewed in 1979, following the first output of graduates.

3.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

3.2 Elective courses

LL411 LANGUAGE ARTS (45 HOURS)

This course is concerned with the development of understanding in the teaching of Language Arts with emphasis on the development of literacy in the primary school. Linguistic aspects of reading and writing are considered to determine methodology for the development of literacy within an integrated Language Arts program. Areas of study include: language and experience; concepts of learning to read; identification and communication skills in reading; relating reading, spelling and writing; diagnosis of reading problems; and research and the language arts.

## UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

1. DIPLOMA OF EDUCATION - DIP.ED. - a one-year end-on pre-service course training secondary teachers.

1.1 Compulsory courses

- In 1977, all students were expected to participate in a voluntary six-hour 'reading' core.
- In 1979, a compulsory independent language and reading course is being taken by all candidates irrespective of their teaching subjects.

The weighting for evaluation purposes is 4 credit points out of the 100 point Dip.Ed. course. (This credit point allocation will be reviewed in 1980.) A summary of compulsory hours (total = 54 hours) for the independent language and reading unit appears below:

(i) Introductory Lectures (4 hours, 1st semester): students are briefed on procedures to be followed in independent study on self-instructional modules to be done over the period June/July when formal classes are at a minimum.

(ii) Independent Module Study (30 hours in June/July): students are required to work the 10 self-instructional modules in Forgan H.W. and Mangram C.T., Teaching Content Area Reading Skills, Columbus Merrill, 1976.

(iii) Formal Lectures and Tutorials (10 + 10 hours, 2nd semester).

1.2 Compulsory courses for students preparing to teach English

ELEMENTS OF ENGLISH A AND ENGLISH B (TOTAL COURSES = 78 HOURS)

Part of these two English curriculum courses include a discussion of language development and literature suitable for the secondary school child. Also discussed are the problems associated with teaching the lower eighty percent of the school population, the 'ordinary child'.

2. BACHELOR OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES - B.ED.ST. - an in-service degree taken by both primary and secondary teachers.

2.1 Compulsory courses

There are no compulsory courses offered specifically in the teaching of reading and language.

2.2 Elective courses

STUDIES IN CURRICULUM A OR B (45 HOURS)

Students may choose to undertake 'language across the curriculum' as the focus for investigation in this workshop subject.

The Schonell Educational Research Centre offers various subjects in Special Education. The major subjects that specifically concentrate on remedial reading are the following:

REMEDIAL EDUCATION I (45 HOURS)

This course covers the psychological and educational factors related to children's difficulties in school learning.

REMEDIAL EDUCATION II (45 HOURS)

This course covers the theoretical and practical aspects of remediation of learning problems.

3. POSTGRADUATE DEGREES

Students may elect to specialise in various aspects of reading and language at the Schonell Educational Research Centre and also in curriculum workshops.

## APPENDICES

### THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH READING AND ASSOCIATED LANGUAGE SKILLS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| APPENDIX A | TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED IN INTERVIEWS OF FIRST YEAR OUT TEACHERS FOR PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR THE TEACHING OF READING PROJECT | 92 |
| APPENDIX B | QUESTIONNAIRE TO COLLEGE STAFF CONCERNED WITH THE TEACHING OF READING AND/OR LANGUAGE ARTS (PHASE I) | 93 |
| APPENDIX C | QUESTIONNAIRE TO PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS CONCERNING THE PRE-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS FOR THE TEACHING OF READING (PHASE II) | 95 |
| APPENDIX D | BEGINNING TEACHER STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE (PHASE III) | 100 |
| APPENDIX E | OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE: PHASE III OF RESEARCH PROJECT ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH READING (INTERVIEWS WITH BEGINNING TEACHERS) | 116 |
| APPENDIX F | DETAILS OF PHASE I SAMPLE (Interviews with Lecturers) | 119 |
| APPENDIX G | DETAILS OF PHASE II SAMPLE (Interviews with Supervising Teachers) | 120 |
| APPENDIX H | DETAILS OF PHASE III SAMPLE (Structured Questionnaire) | 121 |
| APPENDIX I | DETAILS OF PHASE III SAMPLE (Group Interviews with Dip.T.(Primary) December 1978 Graduates) | 122 |
| APPENDIX J | RELEVANT CROSSTABULATIONS | 123 |
| APPENDIX K | MEMBERSHIP OF TEACHER EDUCATION REVIEW COMMITTEE | 124 |

## APPENDIX A

### TOPICS TO BE DISCUSSED IN INTERVIEWS OF FIRST YEAR OUT TEACHERS FOR PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR THE TEACHING OF READING PROJECT

**TIME ALLOCATION:**

How much time allocated in College to English; Language Arts; Reading; content area subjects; personal development?

**READING METHODS:**

- What reading method do you use?
- Did you have adequate training in this method in College?
- Do you have a choice of method, or does your headmaster decide?
- How do you feel about this?
- Do you think that College or practising school helped more in your preparation for the teaching of reading?
- Do you teach reading separately, or as part of language arts?

**READING MATERIAL:**

- Do you choose your class's reading materials, or does your headmaster do it?
- Do you think that you are competent to choose texts?
- Do you feel that there is too wide an array of books to choose from?
- Would you like the Education Department to go back to setting reading texts?
- On what basis did you choose the texts you chose?

**READING PROBLEMS:**

- Do you feel competent to diagnose reading problems in children?
- Do you feel the college gave you enough training in this?
- Is there any remedial reading facility available for you?
- Do you think that poor readers should be taken out of the class for remediation, or do you think that they should remain in the class and be helped by the classroom teacher?
- If so, do you feel competent to deal with reading problems?

**EVALUATION:**

- How do you find out if your students can read or not?
- Do you think you had adequate training in evaluation of reading skills?

**PHILOSOPHY:**

- Do you believe that reading <u>can</u> be taught? If no, did you get this impression from college, or is it your own personal feeling?

**OTHER AREAS FOR DISCUSSION:**

- pre-reading skills;
- teaching reading to disadvantaged children;
- teaching reading to bilingual children;
- parent-teacher co-operation in reading;
- developing comprehension skills in children;
- developing oral language.

## APPENDIX B

### INTERVIEW OF COLLEGE STAFF CONCERNED WITH THE TEACHING OF READING AND/OR LANGUAGE ARTS

### OBJECTIVES WITHIN THE COLLEGE:

1. To what extent do you believe that your objectives can be met in a pre-service program?

2. Is the emphasis in your courses directed towards helping teachers cope with a wide range of problems in the classroom, or is it designed to teach them to work with resource and remedial teachers?

3. How much emphasis do you place on:
   - classroom organisation skills
   - time organisation skills
   - familiarity with a wide range of commercially available reading schemes. Does this include the ability to make critical evaluations of schemes?
   - different methods of teaching children to read
   - evaluation skills
   - library skills. Can they teach library skills themselves, or are they trained to work with teacher librarians?
   - study skills
   - reading for enjoyment
   - assessment of the readability level of books.

   Are there any other aspects which receive major emphasis which I have not mentioned?

4. Are graduates equipped to deal with the teaching of reading at all levels of the primary school?

### THE NATURE OF INSTRUCTION IN READING COURSES:

1. How would you rate the importance of the following methods of teaching students to teach reading:
   - lectures by college staff
   - lectures by visitors
   - small group tutorials
   - student-led seminars
   - individualised work. How would you describe this?
   - micro-teaching.

2. Some people say that teaching techniques in colleges should set the example for the types of teaching techniques recommended to teachers in their classrooms.

   How do you feel about this?

   How do you manage it?

3(a) Is the Language Arts Curriculum Guide easily available to student teachers in your college?

(b) What is your opinion of it?

(c) What do you regard as its function?

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHERS' ABILITIES IN THE TEACHING OF READING:

1. How does the college assess student teachers' ability to teach reading?

LIAISON BETWEEN PRACTISING SCHOOLS AND THE COLLEGE:

1(a) How do you co-ordinate the work you do with students in the college and their teaching practice?

(b) How much time would you estimate that you spend in liaison with the practice teaching supervisors in the schools?

2. Do you find that your students have anough practice and variety in the teaching of reading in the schools?

3. Do you specify the types of reading lessons appropriate for students in the practising schools?

4. How satisfactory do you find the models of teaching reading presented to students in the practising schools?

5. What sort of liaison do you maintain with the teachers who supervise your students?

6(a) How satisfied are you with the contents of the college's Teaching Practicum Guide to schools?

(b) If unsatisfied, what would you add, delete?

LIAISON WITH COLLEGE AFTER GRADUATION:

1. To what degree do you find that teachers in schools consult with you?

2. Does the college offer any formal or informal in-service programmes in the teaching of reading?

- for your own graduates
- for teachers in schools
- for your own lecturers.

STAFF BACKGROUND:

1. At what levels have you taught reading in primary schools?

2. Have you had the opportunity to undertake specialist courses in the teaching of reading?

3. Do you believe such specialist courses would be a good idea?

4. How would you like to see such courses organised?

FINIS:

1. Do you feel that your graduates are being given the opportunity to leave college with a comprehensive overview of the reading process?

2. Anything important I have missed that you would like to bring up?

## APPENDIX C

## QUESTIONNAIRE TO PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS CONCERNING THE PRE-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS FOR THE TEACHING OF READING

### I. QUESTIONS ASKED OF SUPERVISING TEACHERS

#### A. The nature of instruction and practice at practising school

Note: Differentiate Upper School? Middle School? Lower School?

1(a) Do you set reading lessons for student teachers each week of teaching practice which require preparation of 'full notes of lessons' or 'lesson steps' prior to the commencement of the lesson?

(b) . (If yes) How many times approximately each week of teaching practice do your students teach such a reading lesson?

. (If no) How often approximately do your students teach such a reading lesson?

(c) Could you describe the types of reading lessons (which require prior preparation of 'full notes of lessons' or 'lesson steps') that you set the student teacher?

2(a) Do you set reading lessons for student teachers that do not require prior written preparation?

(b) (If so) Could you describe these types of reading lessons?

3(a) Could you describe how you assist the student teacher in the teaching of reading?

Probe questions:

1. Are the lessons that you set preceded by observation lessons?
2. Do you specify the types of reading lessons to be taken or does the student decide him/herself?
3. Do you utilise the Language Arts Curriculum Guide when setting reading lessons for student teachers? If so, how? What is your opinion of it?

(b) . How adequate do you feel your resources are for assisting student teachers in the teaching of reading? (e.g. books, schemes, duplicator stencils, teacher reference books, etc.)

. How adequate are the reading resources organised throughout the school?

4(a) . Are the reading lessons that you set the student teacher integrated into the total Language Arts program (e.g. the development of a theme on 'trains', 'witches', or 'bushrangers')?

. (If so) Could you describe these reading lessons?

(b) . Do you ever set the student teacher reading lessons in other subject areas such as Science, Mathematics or Social Studies?

. (If so) Could you describe these reading lessons?

5(a) Do you ever assign a student teacher to a child or a small group of children to practice teaching of reading skills? Regularly? Occasionally? or Never?

(b) (If students are assigned) Could you describe the types of activities which the student teacher conducts with the child or small group of children?

(c) What would be the reading ability level of the child/ren involved in these activities?

(d) What preparation, if any, is required of the student teacher, prior to the commencement of these activities?

Probe question: Are 'full notes' or 'teaching notes' required?

6. Could you describe how you assess student teachers competence in teaching a reading lesson?

7. What teacher skills do you aim to develop in students through practice in the teaching of reading?

8. What are the problems, if any, that you face when setting a reading lesson for a student teacher?

9. Do you feel that it is possible for you to enable student teachers to get enough practice and variety in the teaching of reading while at practising school?

10. Are you in favour of having student teachers in your classroom?

B. Evaluation of a student's ability to teach reading

(Refer to 1977 or 1978 2nd and 3rd year students)

Note: Differentiate Upper School? Middle School? Lower School?

1(a) Did the student teachers demonstrate any prior knowledge of the reading schemes you use in your classroom, when they began their practice teaching with you?

(b) How knowledgeable were the student teachers about these schemes by the end of their practice teaching with you?

(c) What reading scheme/s do you use in your classroom?

2(a) Did the student teachers demonstrate any prior knowledge of the methods of teaching reading that you use, when they began their practice teaching with you?

(b) How knowledgeable were the student teachers about these methods by the end of their practice teaching with you?

(c) (For reference purposes) Could you describe the methods of teaching reading that you use in your classroom?

3(a) Did any student teachers evaluate a child's reading ability or use a diagnostic reading test during his/her prac.?

Note: If necessary, define a diagnostic test as 'a test to show specific strengths or weaknesses in such reading areas as phonic ability, the ability to use contextual clues, structural analysis ability, etc.)'. Give examples if required: Domain Test of Phonic Ability; Burke and Goodman's Miscue Analysis; St Lucia test of Work Recognition).

(b) (If yes) From your observation, how well did the student teacher evaluate the child in reading or use a diagnostic reading test?

(c) How did the student teacher use the results in your classroom?

(d) Who set the student this exercise, the college or yourself?

(e) What methods of reading evaluation or diagnostic reading tests do you use in your classroom?

4(a) In retrospect, how adequate do you believe the student teachers were equipped with the skills to teach reading?

(b) Do you believe that the student teachers are better equipped than you were when you were doing your pre-service training?

C. Liaison between college and practising school

1(a) Do you set different types of reading lessons to students according to their stage of training in the teaching of reading?

(b) Does the college supply any details concerning a students stage of training in the teaching of reading?

2(a) Is there any discussion between lecturers and school staff concerning student teachers practice in the teaching of reading?

(b) (If so) When does this discussion occur?

(c) How valuable is this discussion?

3(a) Have you ever felt the need to consult a college lecturer concerning any problems in the teaching of reading?

(b) Do you believe that it would be helpful to teachers if there was a resource person from the college or elsewhere readily available to discuss such problems?

(c) (If yes) Who should this resource person be?

4(a) Are there any college in-service courses on the role of supervising teachers in giving teaching of reading practice to student teachers?

(b) (If no) Do you believe that such a course would be beneficial?

(c) (If yes) How could such a course be best organised?

5(a) In some regions, there are steps being made to improve the co-operation between colleges and practising school. One method is for lecturers to demonstrate or teach in the school classroom. Do you believe that it would be beneficial for student teachers if they could observe lecturers teaching reading regularly in a school classroom?

(b) (If so) How could this be beneficial?

(c) Do you think that it would also be beneficial for all other teachers at the school in which the lecturer taught?

(d) (If so) How would this be beneficial?

6(a) What is your opinion of the College's Practice Teaching Guide issued to Practising Schools?

(b) With particular reference to teaching of reading practice, in what ways, if any, would you like this guide improved?

(c) Is a copy of the College Handbook or Calendar readily available for reference in the school?

(d) (If not) Would it be beneficial to have a copy of it in the school?

D. Organisation of training at college and practising school

1(a) From your observation of student teachers, what contribution do you think the college at present makes in the training of student teachers to teach reading?

(b) In organising their courses, are there any aspects in the teaching of reading on which the college should definitely concentrate?

2(a) Is the present organisation of the practising school experience as valuable as it can be in assisting the training of student teachers to teach reading?

(b) Are there any ways in which you feel the organisation of practising school could be improved?

3. What is the relative importance at present of practising school and the college in the training of student teachers to teach reading?

Probe question:

What do you consider are the respective roles of college and practising school in the training of student teachers to teach reading?

E. Finis

1(a) To what extent do you believe that final year students are graduating with the ability to teach reading in the classroom?

(b) How successful do you feel you are in fulfilling your aims in developing student teachers' skills in teaching reading?

2(a) Do you have any opinions on whether the reading standards of primary school children have changed in the last 10 to 15 years?

(b) (If so) What is your opinion?

3. Is there any topic concerning training for the teaching of reading that we have missed, and about which you would like to talk?

4. Any further personal comments or 'hobbyhorses' concerning the teaching of reading?

II. QUESTIONS ASKED OF PRINCIPALS

1(a) How do you co-ordinate the students practice throughout the school?

(b) Do students have a chance to teach reading at all levels of the school?

2. What factors do you take into account when assigining students to their supervising teachers?

3. Do you feel that students get enough practice and variety in the teaching of reading while at practising school?

4. Do you feel that students have adequate models of teaching reading presented to them at practising school?

5(a) Is there any discussion between lecturers and school administration concerning student teachers practice in the teaching of reading?

(b) (If so) When does this discussion occur?

(c) How valuable is this discussion?

6(a) What is your opinion of the College's Practice Teaching Guide issued to Practising Schools?

(b) With particular reference to teaching of reading practice, in what ways, if any, would you like this guide improved?

(c) Does the college send a copy of their handbook or calendar to the school?

(d) (If no) Would it be of benefit to you if a handbook or calendar was supplied?

7(a) What contribution do you think the college at present makes in the training of student teachers to teach reading?

(b) In organising their courses, are there any aspects in the teaching of reading on which the college should definitely concentrate?

8(a) Is the present system of organisation of the practising school experience as valuable as it can be in assisting the training of student teachers to teach reading?

(b) (If no) In what ways do you feel the organisation of the practising school experience could be improved?

9. What is the relative importance of practising school and the college in the training of student teachers to teach reading?

10. From your observation of beginning teachers, to what extent do you believe that final year students are graduating with the ability to teach reading in the classroom?

11(a) How do you induct the beginning teachers into the teaching of reading?

(b) Do you organise in-service programs in the school on the teaching of reading?

(c) If so, who runs them?

12. Do you have any opinions on whether the reading standards of primary school children have changed in the last 10 to 15 years?

(If so) What is your opinion?

13. Is there any topic concerning training for the teaching of reading that we have missed, and about which you would like to talk?

14. Any further personal comments or 'hobbyhorses' concerning the teaching of reading?



99

APPENDIX D

# Board of Teacher Education Queensland

## Teacher Education Review Committee

# Beginning Teacher Questionnaire

**DIRECTIONS:** Unless otherwise indicated, choose one answer only and tick your response in the appropriate box.

When you have completed the questionnaire please make use of the stamped addressed envelope provided and post as soon as possible.

**Nº 428**

- Cover of Questionnaire -

Note: As well as supplying information for the reading project, this questionnaire also aimed to ascertain opinions for a research project the Board is conducting on Induction. Refer pp 1, 2, 6-10 of questionnaire.



100

PART I: GENERAL OPINIONS ON YOUR TEACHER PREPARATION

Office Use Only 1-5

A. General Information

1. Sex

Male ☐ 6

Female ☐

2. Age _____ 7-8

3. What grade do you teach? _____ 9

4. What is the number of pupils in your class? _____ 10-11

5. What is your present teaching situation? 12

. a self-contained classroom and you teach most subjects to one class? ☐

. a self-contained classroom but you mostly teach in a team teaching situation? ☐

. an open area classroom and you teach with one or more teachers? ☐

. Other? ☐

If other, please specify _____

_____

6. How many teachers teach at your school? 13

1 teacher ☐

2 teachers ☐

Between 3 and 5 teachers ☐

Between 6 and 10 teachers ☐

Between 11 and 20 teachers ☐

Between 21 and 30 teachers ☐

Over 30 teachers ☐



101

Office Use Only

7. What is the type of area from which the majority of your children come? 14

- High socio-economic area ☐
- Medium socio-economic area ☐
- Low socio-economic area ☐

8. How difficult are your children to teach? 15

- Always difficult ☐
- Often difficult ☐
- Sometimes difficult ☐
- Seldom difficult ☐
- Never difficult ☐

9. What type of children do you mainly teach? 16

- Migrant children ☐
- Aboriginal children ☐
- An average mixture of children ☐
- Other ☐

(Please specify) _____

_____

10. Where do you think that you've learnt the most teaching skills? 17

- College ☐
- Practising schools ☐
- In school since employment ☐

B. General opinions concerning your pre-service teacher preparation

Office Use Only

11. In which college did you receive your teacher training? _____ 18

12. What is your opinion concerning the amount of course work that was required at college in the following areas?

a) 'Foundation' education courses (e.g., Theories of Education, Philosophy of Education, Sociology of Education, Educational Psychology, Child Development, etc.) 19

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

b) Curriculum content and methodology of primary school subjects (e.g., Language Arts, Mathematics, Reading, Social Studies, Science etc.) 20

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

c) 'Personal Development' or 'Liberal Studies' courses (e.g., Modern Literature, European History, Maths, Biology, Art etc.) 21

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

d) Elective Courses 22

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

On what areas did you concentrate in your electives? _____

Office Use Only

13. In the light of your teaching experience, what is your opinion concerning the preparation you received at college in the following curriculum areas?

| Areas | Very good preparation | Good prep. | Average prep. | Poor prep. | Very poor preparation | Area not studied | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Music | | | | | | | 23 |
| Mathematics | | | | | | | 24 |
| Written Expression | | | | | | | 25 |
| Reading | | | | | | | 26 |
| Art | | | | | | | 27 |
| Spelling | | | | | | | 28 |
| Oral Communication | | | | | | | 29 |
| Physical Education | | | | | | | 30 |
| Social Studies | | | | | | | 31 |
| Science | | | | | | | 32 |
| Grammar | | | | | | | 33 |

14. What are the subjects from those listed above about which you feel you most need to know more? (List up to three subjects, in order of need)

First preference _____ 34

Second preference _____ 35

Third preference _____ 36

15. What is your opinion concerning how well your college courses were co-ordinated with the practice you were given at practising school? 37

Very good co-ordination ☐

Good co-ordination ☐

Average co-ordination ☐

Poor co-ordination ☐

Very poor co-ordination ☐

No opinion ☐

Office Use Only

16. What is your opinion of the amount of time that was spent at practising school during your training? 38

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

17. During what year of your teacher training did you practise teaching in the following classes?

| Class | Year of teacher training | | | No practice in this class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | | |
| Kindergarten | | | | | 39 |
| Year One | | | | | 40 |
| Year Two | | | | | 41 |
| Year Three | | | | | 42 |
| Year Four | | | | | 43 |
| Year Five | | | | | 44 |
| Year Six | | | | | 45 |
| Year Seven | | | | | 46 |

18. In general, what is your opinion of the quality of the help which you received at practising school? 47

- Very good quality ☐
- Good quality ☐
- Average quality ☐
- Poor quality ☐
- Very poor quality ☐
- No opinion ☐

19. Of the subjects listed in Question 13

- Which subject did you most enjoy teaching at practising school? _____ 48
- Which subject did you least enjoy teaching at practising school? _____ 49

C: General opinions concerning your induction into the profession

Office Use Only

20. Did you visit the school to which you were appointed before the commencement of first term? 50

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, how helpful was this visit? 51

Of very great help ☐

Of great help ☐

Of some help ☐

Of little help ☐

Of no help ☐

Not applicable ☐

No opinion ☐

21. How have you been introduced or inducted into teaching at your school? (Answer below) 52

_____

_____

_____

_____

22. Of the subjects listed in Question 13

a) What subject do you most enjoy teaching to your own class? _____ 53

b) What subject do you least enjoy teaching to your own class? _____ 54

c) What has been the easiest subject to teach to your own class? _____ 55

d) What has been the most difficult subject to teach to your own class? _____ 56

Office Use Only

23. What is your opinion concerning the following types of help you have received in your first months of teaching? (Circle the appropriate symbol).

Key to symbols: VG = of very great help
G = of great help
S = of some help
L = of little help
N = of no help
NA = help not available or not occurred
NOP = no opinion

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .1 | Advice from principal | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 57 |
| .2 | Advice from other administrators | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 58 |
| .3 | Advice from other classroom teacher/s | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 59 |
| .4 | Advice from resource or remedial teacher/s | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 60 |
| .5 | Advice from guidance officer/s | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 61 |
| .6 | Advice from college lecturer/s | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 62 |
| .7 | Observing demonstration lessons | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 63 |
| .8 | Attendance at regular school staff meetings | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 64 |
| .9 | Attendance at school meetings for beginning teachers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 65 |
| .10 | Attendance at school workshops for beginning teachers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 66 |
| .11 | Working on school curriculum committees | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 67 |
| .12 | Consulting various curriculum guides | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 68 |
| .13 | Consulting various 'text' books | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 69 |
| .14 | Consulting lesson notes prepared for practising school | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 70 |
| .15 | Consulting material, notes (etc) provided by college during training | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 71 |
| .16 | Using resource material you prepared during training | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 72 |
| .17 | Attendance at a local teachers' centre | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 73 |
| .18 | Visiting other schools | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 74 |
| .19 | Attendance at meeting/s of a professional association | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 75 |
| | Which association? _____ | | | | | | | | |
| .20 | Other help (please specify) _____ | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 76 |



107

Office Use Only
Card 2
1-5

24. Do you believe that a systematic introduction to teaching (induction program) should be introduced sometime during a teacher's first year? 6

- Yes ☐
- No ☐
- No opinion ☐

25. If a systematic induction program was introduced in a teacher's first year:

a) where should the induction program be mainly conducted? 7

- At colleges ☐
- In schools ☐
- At teacher centres ☐
- Other ☐

Specify _____

b) who should conduct such a program? 8

- School principals ☐
- College lecturers ☐
- School principals in consultation with colleges ☐
- College lecturers in consultation with school principals ☐
- Advisory teachers ☐
- Experienced classroom teachers ☐
- Staff from Teacher centres ☐
- Other ☐

Specify _____

Office Use Only

Question 25(cont'd)

c) when should this program be conducted?

1) In school hours during term ☐ 9

2) Outside school hours during term ☐

3) During school vacation/s ☐

4) Both 1 and 2 above ☐

5) Both 1 and 3 above ☐

6) Both 2 and 3 above ☐

7) 1, 2 and 3 above ☐

8) Other ☐

Specify _____

d) how many hours per week should be devoted to such a program? _____ 10-11

e) for how many weeks should the program be conducted? _____ 12-13

f) when should such a program commence? 14

Beginning of the year ☐

Middle of the year ☐

Towards the end of the year ☐

Other ☐

Specify _____

26. What topics would you suggest be included in such a systematic induction program? (Circle the appropriate symbol)

Key to symbols: VD = Very desirable
D = Desirable
N = Neutral
U = Undesirable
VU = Very undesirable

| | | | | | | | Office Use Only |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .1 | General teaching strategies (asking questions, beginning and closure of lessons etc.) | VD | D | N | U | VU | 15 |
| .2 | Use of teaching materials and resources | VD | D | N | U | VU | 16 |
| .3 | School administrative procedures | VD | D | N | U | VU | 17 |
| .4 | Departmental regulations | VD | D | N | U | VU | 18 |
| .5 | Knowledge of law of interest to teachers | VD | D | N | U | VU | 19 |
| .6 | Planning of Current Curriculum Program | VD | D | N | U | VU | 20 |
| .7 | Philosophy of Education | VD | D | N | U | VU | 21 |
| .8 | Providing individualized instruction | VD | D | N | U | VU | 22 |
| .9 | Relating to parents | VD | D | N | U | VU | 23 |
| .10 | Sociology of Education | VD | D | N | U | VU | 24 |
| .11 | Educational Psychology | VD | D | N | U | VU | 25 |
| .12 | Organizing and teaching a class in a group situation | VD | D | N | U | VU | 26 |
| .13 | Theories of education | VD | D | N | U | VU | 27 |
| .14 | Methods of teaching in various Primary curriculum areas | VD | D | N | U | VU | 28 |
| .15 | Organizing and implementing extra-curricula activities | VD | D | N | U | VU | 29 |
| .16 | Using community resources (including people) in the classroom | VD | D | N | U | VU | 30 |
| .17 | Dealing with learning problems | VD | D | N | U | VU | 31 |
| .18 | Teaching in an 'open area' situation | VD | D | N | U | VU | 32 |
| .19 | Handling of children with behaviour problems | VD | D | N | U | VU | 33 |
| .20 | Other (please specify) | VD | D | N | U | VU | 34 |



110

PART II: OPINIONS ON YOUR PREPARATION IN THE TEACHING OF READING AND ASSOCIATED LANGUAGE SKILLS

Office Use Only

A. College

27. What is your opinion concerning:

a) the amount of compulsory coursework in 'the teaching of reading' at college? 35

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

b) the amount of elective coursework offered in 'the teaching of reading' at college? 36

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- No opinion ☐

28. How many compulsory courses did you study in which the 'teaching of reading' was an integral and substantial component? 37
(Circle the appropriate numbers)

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

29. How many elective courses did you study in which the 'teaching of reading' was an integral and substantial component? 38
(Circle the appropriate numbers)

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8



111

Office Use Only

30. In light of your teaching experience, what is your opinion concerning the preparation you received at college in the following areas of reading? (Circle the appropriate symbol).

Key to symbols: VG = Very good preparation
G = Good preparation
A = Average preparation
P = Poor preparation
VP = Very poor preparation
NS = Not studied

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| .1 | The psychology of reading process | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 39 |
| .2 | the contents of the Language Arts Curriculum Guide | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 40 |
| .3 | how to teach readiness for beginning reading | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 41 |
| .4 | how to teach sight vocabulary | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 42 |
| .5 | how to teach phonic skills | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 43 |
| .6 | how to teach meanings of words | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 44 |
| .7 | how to teach comprehension skills | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 45 |
| .8 | how to teach study skills | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 46 |
| .9 | how to devise a reading program from available resources | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 47 |
| .10 | how to use the reading scheme/s in your classroom | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 48 |
| .11 | how to organize a class into different reading groups | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 49 |
| .12 | how to manage simultaneously the reading groups in a class | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 50 |
| .13 | how to individualize reading instruction | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 51 |
| .14 | how to select appropriate reading material in Social Science, Maths, Science etc. | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 52 |
| .15 | how to determine the readability of reading material | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 53 |
| .16 | how to select and administer reading tests | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 54 |
| .17 | how to construct appropriate reading tests | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 55 |
| .18 | how to diagnose reading problems | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 56 |
| .19 | how to plan and provide appropriate remedial instruction | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 57 |
| .20 | how to promote an interest in reading | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 58 |
| .21 | a knowledge of the role of remedial/ resource teachers | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 59 |
| .22 | a knowledge of the role of guidance officers | VG | G | A | P | VP | NS | 60 |

31. Are there any of the above areas about which you feel you need to know more? (List up to 3 areas in order of preference)

First preference _____ 61

Second preference _____ 62

Third preference _____ 63



112

B. Practising School

Office Use Only

32. What is your opinion concerning the amount of practice you received in the teaching of reading at practising school? 64

- Too much ☐
- About right ☐
- Too little ☐
- I did not practise teaching reading ☐
- No opinion ☐

33. In general, what is your opinion of the help which you received in the teaching of reading from classroom supervisors in the following school levels?

| | Very good | Good | Average | Poor | Very poor | No practice at this level | No opinion | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | | | | | | | | 65 |
| Lower primary (Yrs. 1 & 2) | | | | | | | | 66 |
| Middle Primary (Yrs. 3, 4 & 5) | | | | | | | | 67 |
| Upper primary (Yrs. 6 & 7) | | | | | | | | 68 |

34. In general, what is your opinion of the help you received from school administrators (e.g., Principals, Infant Mistresses etc.) in the teaching of reading at practising school? 69

- Very good ☐
- Good ☐
- Average ☐
- Poor ☐
- Very poor ☐
- No help received ☐
- No opinion ☐

Office Use Only

35. In general, what is your opinion of the help you received from visiting lecturers in the teaching of reading at practising school? 70

- Very good ☐
- Good ☐
- Average ☐
- Poor ☐
- Very poor ☐
- No help received ☐
- No opinion ☐

36. At practising school, were you allowed to choose the type of lesson on which you would be assessed by the visiting lecturer? 71

- Always ☐
- Often ☐
- Sometimes ☐
- Seldom ☐
- Never ☐

37. How many times did you teach a reading lesson for the purpose of a lecturer's observation and assessment? 72
(Circle the appropriate number).

None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

C. First Year Teaching

38. How have you been introduced or inducted into the teaching of reading at your school? 73
(Answer below)

_____

_____

_____

_____

39. What is your opinion concerning the following types of help you have received in the teaching of reading since you have started teaching?

Key to symbols: VG = Of very great help
G = Of great help
S = Of some help
L = Of little help
N = Of no help
NA = Help not available or not occurred
NOP = No opinion

| | | | | | | | | | Office Use Only |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a) | Advice from principal | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 74 |
| b) | Advice from other administrators | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 75 |
| c) | Advice from other classroom teachers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 76 |
| d) | Advice from resource/ remedial teachers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 77 |
| e) | Advice from guidance officers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 78 |
| f) | Advice from college lecturers | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 79 |
| g) | Other (please specify) _____ | VG | G | S | L | N | NA | NOP | 80 |



115

## APPENDIX E

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE: PHASE III OF RESEARCH PROJECT ON THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS TO TEACH READING (INTERVIEWS WITH BEGINNING TEACHERS)

A. INTRODUCTION

1. In Question 10 on page 2 of the Beginning Teacher Structured Questionnaire (SQ), you gave your opinion on where you thought you had learnt the most teaching skills. Could you tell me what answer you chose and why you chose it?

B. PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION

College:

1(a) In what ways do you feel your college preparation was most helpful? (Refer SQ p.3)

(b) In what ways do you feel your college preparation was least helpful? (Refer SQ p.3)

2. In Question 13 on page 4 of SQ, you gave your opinions concerning the preparation you received in various curriculum areas. What do you generally feel about your preparation in these areas?

3. In Question 14 on page 4 of SQ, you wrote down the subjects about which you most need to know more.

Could you tell me:

(a) Why you chose those subjects?

(b) What are the aspects of the subjects about which you want to know more?

4. Are there any further comments which you wish to make about your college preparation?

Practising School:

5(a) In what ways do you feel your practising school experience was most helpful? (Refer SQ p.5)

(b) What did you feel best about at practising school?

6(a) In what ways do you feel your practising school experience was least helpful? (Refer SQ p.5)

(b) What was the biggest problem that you faced at practising school?

7. How well did your teaching practice fit in with what you were doing at college? (Refer SQ p.4, Q.15)

8. Are there any further comments which you wish to make concerning your practising school experience?

C. INTRODUCTION TO TEACHING

1. Could you describe how you were introduced to teaching at your school? (Refer SQ p.6, Q.21)

2(a) What has been of most benefit to you in your first months of teaching? (Refer SQ pp 5-7)

(b) What has been of least benefit to you in your first months of teaching?

3. What are the main problems that you have encountered so far?

4. In Question 24 on page 8 of SQ, you gave your opinions concerning a systematic induction program. Could you describe how you feel about this idea?

5. On pages 8, 9 and 10 of SQ you have your opinions on how you thought a systematic induction program should be organised. Would you like to add any further comments on this topic?

Probe:

In general, how would you like to see an induction program organised so that it could be of greatest benefit to you.

6. Are there any further general comments which you wish to make concerning your first months of teaching?

D. PREPARATION IN THE TEACHING OF READING

College: (Refer SQ pp 11-12)

7(a) In what ways do you feel your college preparation in the teaching of reading was most helpful?

(b) In what ways do you feel your college preparation in the teaching of reading was least helpful?

8. Are there any ways, if any, in which you would like to see college courses in the teaching of reading improved?

Probe:

In organising their courses, are there any aspects in the teaching of reading on which the college should definitely concentrate?

9. Are there any further comments which you wish to make concerning your college preparation in the teaching of reading?

Practising School: (Refer SQ pp 13-14)

10(a) In what ways do you feel your practising school experience in the teaching of reading was most helpful?

(b) In what ways do you feel your practising school experience in the teaching of reading was least helpful?

11. Would you describe how you were assisted in the teaching of reading at practising school?

Probes:

- Was the L.A.C.G. utilised in the setting of reading lessons?
- Were the lessons usually preceded by observation lessons?
- Were the types of lessons to be taught usually specified by the supervising teacher?
- Were you generally shown how to use the classroom reading program/scheme?

12. Would you describe the main types of practice that you received in the teaching of reading?

Probes:

- What types of reading lessons, if any, were set which required prior written preparation of 'full notes of lessons' or 'lesson steps'? In the Lower school? Middle school? Upper school?
- What was the usual number of children to which the written prepared lessons were directed?
  To a small group? To an individual? To the whole class?
- Did you ever teach reading lessons that did not require written preparation? Would you describe these?

13. Are there any ways, if any, in which you feel the organisation of the practising school experience could be improved?

14. Are there any further comments which you wish to make concerning your practising school experience in the teaching of reading?

First Year of Teaching: (Refer SQ pp 14-15)

15. Could you describe how you were introduced to the teaching of reading at your school?

16(a) What has been of most benefit to you in your first months of teaching reading?

(b) What has been of least benefit to you in your first months of teaching reading?

17. What problems have you encountered so far, in the teaching of reading?

18. What are the areas of reading that you would like to see included in a systematic induction program?

19. How well do you believe that you graduated with the ability to teach reading in the classroom?

20. Are there any further comments which you wish to make concerning your experiences so far in the teaching of reading?

## APPENDIX F

DETAILS OF PHASE I SAMPLE (Interviews with Lecturers)

| Teacher Training Institutions | No. of Lecturers Participating | Interview Date |
|---|---|---|
| Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College | 5 | 24 November 1977 |
| Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education | 3 | 4 November 1977 |
| Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education | 3 | 5 December 1977 |
| James Cook University | 2 | 28 November 1977 |
| Kelvin Grove College of Advanced Education | 7 | 16 November 1977 |
| McAuley College | 6 | 23 November 1977 |
| Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education | 8 | 6 December 1977 |
| North Brisbane College of Advanced Education | 8 | 1 December 1977 |
| Townsville College of Advanced Education | 2 | 29 November 1977 |
| University of Queensland | 2 | 7 December 1977 |
| Xavier Teachers College | 1 | 18 November 1977 |
| TOTAL | 47 | |

## APPENDIX G

A. DETAILS OF PHASE II SAMPLE (Interviews with Supervising Teachers)

| Name of College | | BKTC | NBCAE | MGCAE | TCAE | CIAE | KGCAE | DDIAE | McAC | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. of associated practising schools | | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 28 |
| No. of Supervising Teachers | Pre-School | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| | Lower School (Years 1 & 2) | - | 12 | 12 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 4 | 59 |
| | Middle School (Years 3,4,5) | - | 14 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 72 |
| | Upper School (Years 6 & 7) | - | 16 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 14 | 7 | 4 | 71 |
| | Total | 3 | 42 | 41 | 25 | 14 | 42 | 24 | 14 | 205 |
| No. of Administrators | | - | 6 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 44 |

B. INTERVIEW DATES

Brisbane Kindergarten Teachers College
Associated Practising Schools (BKTC): 12, 13, 28 April 1978

North Brisbane College of Advanced Education
Associated Practising Schools (NBCAE): 18, 19, 20, 24, 27 April 1978

Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education
Associated Practising Schools (MGCAE): 25, 29 May; 1, 6, 7 June 1978

Townsville College of Advanced Education
Associated Practising Schools (TCAE): 19, 20, 21 June 1978

Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education
Associated Practising Schools (CIAE): 22, 23 June 1978

Kelvin Grove College of Advanced Education 25 July; 7, 10, 30 August;
Associated Practising Schools (KGCAE): 4 October 1978

Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education
Associated Practising Schools (DDIAE): 3, 5, 12 October 1978

McAuley College
Associated Practising Schools (McAC): 31 October; 9 November 1978


120

## APPENDIX H

DETAILS OF PHASE III SAMPLE (Structured Questionnaire)

| College | No. Dip.T. (Primary) Dec. 1978 Graduates | No. Dip.T. (Primary) Dec. 1978 Graduates sent a questionnaire | No. of questionnaires returned |
|---|---|---|---|
| KGCAE | 166 | 41 | 33 |
| NBCAE | 237 | 59 | 55 |
| MGCAE | 156 | 38 | 35 |
| McAC | 67 | 16 | 14 |
| DDIAE | 144 | 36 | 30 |
| CIAE | 87 | 22 | 18 |
| TCAE | 136 | 34 | 30 |
| TOTAL | 993 | 246 | 215 (1) |

(1) In a previously published report summary, which was prepared for the Board's conference, Saturday, 26 May 1979, the total number of questionnaires was reported as 209. While that report was being printed, a further six questionnaires were returned. These questionnaires are included in this final report.

## APPENDIX I

DETAILS OF PHASE III SAMPLE (Group Interviews with Dip.T. (Primary) December 1978 Graduates)

| College | Number of Graduates who were interviewed | Date of Interview at Bardon Professional Development Centre |
|---|---|---|
| KGCAE | 10 | 22 March 1979 |
| NBCAE | 9 | 26 March 1979 |
| MGCAE | 10 | 28 March 1979 |
| McAC | 9 | 29 March 1979 |
| DDIAE | 8 (1) | 3 April 1979 |
| CIAE | 3 (2) | 4 April 1979 |
| TCAE | 3 (2) | 4 April 1979 |
| TOTAL | 52 | |

(1) Only one DDIAE graduate from the original sample (Appendix H) lived in Brisbane. A further seven DDIAE graduates resident in Brisbane, who were outside the original sample, were therefore located and interviewed.

(2) There were no CIAE and TCAE graduates in the original sample who were resident in Brisbane. However, six CIAE and TCAE graduates resident in Brisbane were located and interviewed together in one group.

## APPENDIX J

**CROSSTABLE J.1** Relevant section of Crosstable Opinion on the amount of compulsory coursework in the teaching of reading at College (Column) BY Number of compulsory courses undertaken in the teaching of Reading at College (Row)

NUMBER OF COMPULSORY READING COURSES OFFERED

| | Count / Row % / Col % / Total % | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPINIONS ON | | 7 | 67 | 48 | 18 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 149 |
| AMOUNT OF | Too | 4.7 | 45.0 | 32.2 | 12.1 | 3.4 | 0.7 | 2.0 | 71.3% (of |
| COMPULSORY | Little | 87.5 | 80.7 | 69.6 | 54.5 | 55.6 | 33.3 | 75.0 | of total |
| COURSEWORK | | 3.3 | 32.1 | 23.0 | 8.6 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 1.4 | sample) |

**CROSSTABLE J.2** Relevant section of Crosstable opinions on the amount of elective coursework in the teaching of reading at College (Column) BY Number of elective courses undertaken in the teaching of reading at College (Row)

NUMBER OF ELECTIVE READING COURSES UNDERTAKEN

| | Count / Row % / Col % / Total % | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | Row Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OPINIONS ON | | 80 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 123 |
| AMOUNT OF | Too | 65.0 | 26.8 | 6.5 | 1.6 | 59.7 (of |
| ELECTIVE | Little | 62.5 | 54.1 | 53.3 | 100.0 | total |
| COURSEWORK | | 38.8 | 16.0 | 3.9 | 1.0 | sample) |

**CROSSTABLE J.3** Relevant section of Crosstable Grades which Beginning Teachers teach in their first year out (Column) BY the year of teacher training in which Beginning Teachers practised in Grade 2 at Practising School (Row)

YEAR OF TEACHER TRAINING BECINNING TEACHERS PRACTISED IN GRADE 2

| | Count / Row % / Col % / Total | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | No Practice | Years 1,2 | Years 2,3 | Years 1,3 | Years 1,2,3 | Row Total Row % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GRADE | Grade 2 | 17 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 40 |
| TAUGHT IN | | 42.5 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 12.5 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 21.3 (of |
| FIRST YEAR | | 31.5 | 19.4 | 18.6 | 15.2 | 0.0 | 15.4 | 22.2 | 0.0 | total |
| OUT | | 9.0 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | sample) |



123

## APPENDIX K

### TEACHER EDUCATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

(membership during the conducting of reading project – June 1977 to December 1979)

- Mr W.L. Hamilton (Chairman), B.Econ., B.Ed.(Qld), M.Ed.(Alberta), F.A.C.E., Deputy Director-General of Education, Queensland Department of Education.
- Mr R. Beevers, C.Ed., C.R.Ed., M.Ed., L.C.P., M.A.C.E., Head of School of Education, Capricornia Institute of Advanced Education (commenced July 1979)
- Dr J. Elkins, B.Sc., B.Ed., Ph.D., M.A.C.E., M.A.P.S., Senior Lecturer, Schonell Educational Research Centre, University of Queensland (commenced July 1978)
- Dr R.D. Goodman, B.A., B.Ed., Ph.D., Reader in Education, University of Queensland (resigned June 1979)
- Dr W.C. Hall, B.Sc.(Hons), M.Sc., Ph.D.(London), Director, Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education (commenced March 1978)
- Mr B. Hill, Dip.Teach., Teacher, Infants School, Mabel Park (commenced July 1979)
- Mr K. Imison, B.A.(Hons)(Syd.), M.Ed.(Hons), A.L.A.M., M.A.C.E., Dean, School of Education, Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education, (commenced September 1979)
- Br. N.T. Landener, B.A., B.Sc., M.Ed., Deputy Principal, Christian Brothers College, Nudgee (resigned February 1978)
- Mr A.R. MacKee, B.Sc., B.Ed.(Qld), M.A.(Texas), M.A.C.E., Director, Townsville College of Advanced Education (resigned April 1979)
- Mr I. Matheson, B.Ed., B.A., General Staff Inspector, Primary Education, Queensland Department of Education (1) (March 1978 – December 1978)
- Sr P. Nolan, B.A., Dip.Ed.Admin.(U.N.E.), Principal, McAuley College (commenced March 1978)
- Mr G. Streets, B.A., B.Ed.(Hons), M.Ed., M.A.C.E., Head of Department of Teacher Education, North Brisbane College of Advanced Education (commenced July 1979)
- Mr P. Thomas, B.A.(Hons), M.A., M.A.P.S., Lecturer, Mount Gravatt College of Advanced Education (October 1977 – February 1978)
- Professor B.H. Watts, O.B.E., B.A., B.Ed., Ph.D., F.A.C.E., Professor of Special Education, University of Queensland (resigned May 1978)
- Mr E.F. Shogren (ex officio), B.A., B.Ed., Executive Officer, Board of Teacher Education (retired September 1978)
- Mr N.H. Fry (ex officio), B.A., B.Sc., B.Ed.(Melb.), M.Ed.Admin.(Qld), Executive Officer, Board of Teacher Education (commenced January 1979)

Research Personnel

- Mr C. Dean, B.A., B.Ed.St., Research Officer, Board of Teacher Education (January 1978 – December 1979)
- Ms S. Geason, B.A., M.A., Research Assistant, Board of Teacher Education (July 1977 – January 1978)
- Ms G. Hopes, B.A., Dip.Psych., Graduate Assistant, Board of Teacher Education (March 1979 – December 1979)

(1) Mr Matheson is now Regional Director, North-Western Region, Queensland Department of Education.


124